

SRI
VENKATESWARA UNIVERSITY
O IENTAL JOU NAL
TIRUPATI



EDITOR
Prof. J. CHENNA REDDY, M.A., Ph.D.
Director, Oriental Research Institute

CONTENTS

ENGLISH

1. <i>Ahalyā's Episode – Its Different Versions</i>	— Prof. T. Kodandaramaiah	...	1
2. <i>Pañcaśikha</i>	— Sri D. Satyanarayana	...	15
3. <i>Theft in Dharmaśāstra</i>	— Dr. R. S. Betai	...	23
4. <i>The Rhyme in Sanskrit Literature</i>	— Arati Mitra	...	35
5. <i>A Comparative Study of the Social Customs of Bengal and Mithilā as recorded in the Works of Raghunandana and Vācaspati Miśra</i>	— Dr. Bani Chakravorthy	...	45
6. <i>Influence of Telugu on Sanskrit</i>	— Dr. P. Sriramamurti	...	53
7. <i>The Two Sects in South Indian Vaiṣṇavism</i>	— Dr. N. Subbu Reddiar	...	57
8. <i>Vedāntadeśika and Siṃhabhūpāla</i>	— Sri K. N. Srinivasan	...	71
9. <i>Mountains and Rivers of South India as provided in the Skāndapurāṇa</i>	— Dr. Umakant Thakur	...	79
10. <i>Kākatālīya – A Grammatical Analysis by Bhartṛhari</i>	— Sri Mithilesh Chaturvedi	...	93
11. <i>The Tamil Society of the Saṅgam Age</i>	— Prof. V. Perumal	...	101
12. <i>On Śūlapāṇi – The Interpreter of the Yājñavalkya Smṛiti</i>	— Dr. S. G. Moghe	...	113

13. MISCELLANEOUS :

- (i) *A Note on Āndhra Painters*
— Sri H. V. Ramagopal ... 12
- (ii) *Lakṣaṇa Daṇḍanāyaka*
— Sri B. V. Srinivasa Rao ... 12
- (iii) *A Note on Bhartṛmītra the Mīmāṃsaka*
— Dr. Biswanath Bhattacharya ... 13

SANSKRIT

1. अव्ययीभाव परीक्षा
— Dr. V. Krishnaswamy Iyengar ... 1
2. भारविप्रणीते किरातार्जुनीये कार्यविधायोजना
— Dr. Sushama Kulshreshtha ... 23

TELUGU

1. రక్షిరాజం సాంస్కృతిక మూర్తిమత్తము
— Sri K. J. Krishna Moorthy ... 1

HINDI

1. शुक संप्रदाय के कृष्ण
— Dr. Chandhraprakash Agarwal ... 1

PROF. T. KODANDARAMAIAH

AHALYĀ'S EPISODE - ITS DIFFERENT VERSIONS

Ahalyā's episode appears in the *Bala kāṇḍa* of Vālmiki's great epic, *Rāmāyaṇa*. The same has been repeated in the *Uttarakāṇḍa* also. The first one aims at the extinction of Ahalyā's sin. The second relates to the remedy of the sin committed by Indra, the lord of heavens. The story of Ahalyā attracted many a poet and in their attempt to narrate the same in their own way we find different versions. The names of the characters connected with this episode and a reference to the theme are first to be seen in the *Taittirīya āraṇyaka*. While inviting Indra to the sacrifice, he is addressed in it as follows :

*Indrāgaccha Hariṇa āgaccha Mēdhātithēḥ
Meṣavṛṣaṇāśvasya mene
Gaurāvaskandinn ahalyāyājārā
Kauśika brāhmaṇa Gautama bruvāṇā*

Sāyaṇa's commentary to this hymn is as follows :

Indra! who is otherwise called Hari and who possesses a horse by name Hari! You are welcome to the Sacrifice. Please come. Indra who possesses Medhātithi, the son of Kaṇva as the arrow and who loved Menakā, the daughter of Vṛṣaṇāśva! Please do come to the sacrificial hall putting on the guise of a white deer (*Gaura mṛga*).

The commentary does not supply any vedic meaning to the term '*Ahalyāyājārā*' in the hymn.

Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara's bhāṣya for the same hymn can be translated as follows :

Indra! who is responsible for the creation of the universal sounds that form the vocabulary or who possesses the greatness which cannot be described in words! You have come to the sage Medhātithi.

You have approached the wife of Gautama as debaucher. You have enlightened Kauśika in the guise of a brahmin.

In this commentary, the term '*Ahalyāyaijārā*' is explained to mean one who is responsible for the evolution of speech, '*Vākpariṇāmākāraka*'. The word *Gaurā* is explained as *Gautamadārā* the wife of Gautama, by uniting the first and the last syllables of the compound. We find the names of the characters such as Gautama, Ahalyā, Indra, Ahalyājārā, Mēṣavṛṣaṇa and Kauśika connected with the Ahalyā's episode in the above hymn. The concealed story found in the Vedas attained a beautiful and complete shape in the *Rāmāyaṇa* by connecting it to the hero of the epic, Rāma. He not only purifies Ahalyā as is seen in *Rāmāyaṇa*, but also gives a sort of completeness to the story. In the Bāla kāṇḍa, Ahalyā's episode is narrated at length by the sage, Viśvāmitra, to Rāma. After protecting the sacrifice of Viśvāmitra from the evil forces, Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa followed Viśvāmitra to the great city, Mithilā, witnessing on the way the marvellous beauties of nature and listening to the utterances of advice of Viśvāmitra. They reached the outskirts of Mithilā. There they saw an old but beautiful hermitage inhabited by none. That was the *āśrama* of the sage Gautama. Rāma was inquisitive to know about the story connected with it. Then Kauśika narrates the story to him.

Gautama was a great sage. Ahalyā was his wife. She was very beautiful. The sage was engaged himself in performing a great penance. Several years passed away. When Gautama was away from his *āśrama*, Indra came there in his guise. He wished to have sexual intercourse with her. She replied that it was not the menstrual period to have such a thing. Indra told that *kāmalola*, a man of lust, would not wait for the menstrual period to come. She knew that he was Indra. She complied with his request, in the desire to satisfy the lord of heavens. She was very happy that she had highest enjoyment with him and expressed her gratitude to him. She requested him to save the interests of both. Indra simply laughed away and did not reply. He was afraid that Gautama would return home. He came out of the *āśrama*. Gautama came there. He had his morning bath in the sacred waters and was carrying the *samit* and *kuśa* in his hand for the sacrificial fire. He was glooming like a fire. On seeing the sage entering the *āśrama*, Indra feared much and became pale. Gautama raged with anger. He cursed him to become a '*viphala*' which meant that he would be deprived of his testicles. The word of the sage did have its effect. He also cursed his wife, Ahalyā. He cursed that she would live on air alone without taking any food whatsoever, and lie unseen on the ashes for thousands of years. He also told the termination of his curse. Rāma would come to those forests. She would be purified on his arrival to that place. After having extended her hospi-

tality to him she would get out of the clutches of *lobha* and *moha*, the desire and the lust. Then she would regain her former place by his side and she would be happy for ever. After having cursed his wife, Gautama left for the Himālayas. Indra was successful in obstructing the penance of Gautama thus, which he did in the interest of the *devas*, but due to the curse of Gautama, he lost his testicles and they were replaced by those of a goat. He was called 'Meṣa-viṣṇa' one who possessed the testicles of a goat, from that day onwards.

Kauśika narrated the story to Rāma and asked him to step into the *āśrama* in order to purify Ahalyā. Rāma entered the *āśrama*. Brahmā wished to create a most beautiful lady on the earth and Ahalyā was created by him with great effort. She was not visible then due to the curse of Gautama. The effect of his curse waned away at the appearance of Rāma on the scene. Ahalyā stood before them in her original form with all her beauty. Both Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa bowed to her. She extended her hospitality to them. Gautama came back from the Himālayas. The couple, Ahalyā and Gautama, worshipped Rāma. Then Rāma started for Mithilā. The couple lived happily for the rest of their life.

The story of Ahalyā that is found in the *Uttarakāṇḍa* of *Rāmāyaṇa* seems to be a supplement to that of the *Bālakāṇḍa*.

Brahmā released Indra from Indrajit who took him as a captive and tied him with ropes. Indra was all in shame and lost all his divine charm. It was the result of Gautama's curse. Brahmā ridiculed him that he had to experience all that, having indulged in an act of sin without minding the consequences. He reminded Indra, who was already feeling a lot for his defeat at the hands of Indrajit, about his past deeds. The narration of Brahmā goes as follows :

Brahmā created many human beings in the world. All of them had the same colour, complexion and form without any distinction. They spoke only one language. What charm will be there in such a society? So, as a trial, for variety sake, He desired to create one lady of extra-ordinary beauty. He drew the most handsome part found in various human beings and created a lady of extra-ordinary physical as well as mental features. He named her as Ahalyā. *Hala* meant a disform. *Halyā* meant disformity. One who was devoid of disformity was Ahalyā and thus Brahmā explained the name that was given to his new creation. Brahmā was in a fix to whom she should be given in marriage. Indra wished to have her for himself because of the highest position that he occupied. But Brahmā entrusted her to the care of Gautama, the great sage. Several years passed by. Gautama stood to the test of Brahmā. Brahmā was very much pleased with the strong

will and steadfastness of the sage and also with his achievements of penance. He made her his wife. The *devas* were very much disappointed. Indra was envious of Gautama. He fell in love with Ahalyā and wooed her. She was also inclined and he enjoyed in her company. Gautama, knowing about this, cursed him. He cursed that Indra would be taken as a captive in the war by his enemy. Henceforth the mortals would indulge much in debauchery without fear or favour, while half of the sin due to the possession of illicit connection with another man's wife would go to the person who indulged in such an act, the other half would go to Indra. The position of Indra would not be stable henceforth and whoever became Indra, he would not be there in that position for long. He cursed Ahalyā as follows: 'Having been deprived of your beauty, you will lie in the āśrama for thousands of years lamenting for your sinful act. The beauty that made you swerve from the righteous path will hereafter be common to all human beings. Rāma will release you from the effects of the curse'.

As a result of this curse Ahalyā became a rock and was eagerly awaiting the arrival of Rāma performing a sort of penance. The human beings attained extra-ordinary beauty. Indra performed the Vaiṣṇava sacrifice and adorned the throne of the heavens.

In the aforesaid story of *Uttarakāṇḍa*, the following points are to be noted: The etymology of the word *Ahalyā*, the circumstances or the manner in which Ahalyā became the wife of Gautama, the series of curses made to Ahalyā and Indra, the direct and indirect consequences of the curses being indulgence of the people in illegal relationship with others' wives and the women's attainment of beauty.

Indra being deprived of his testicles which appears in *Bālakāṇḍa* and Ahalyā becoming a rock which finds a place in the *Uttarakāṇḍa* of the *Rāmāyaṇa* attracted many later poets.

In Vālmīki's *Rāmāyaṇa* we do not find the incident stating that Indra took the guise of a cock and crowed in the āśrama, even before the dawn, so that Gautama leaves for the river to perform his morning rites after taking a bath in the holy waters as is mentioned in some of the later works. Indra becoming a *Sahasrākṣa* as a result of Gautama's curse is also not to be seen in Vālmīki *Rāmāyaṇa*. In the *Adhyātma Rāmāyaṇa* (A.D. fifth century) Gautama curses Indra that he would become '*Sahasrabhagavān*' – one who possesses thousand *bhagas* which appear to others only as eyes. Gautama curses Ahalyā that she would lie like a rock in his āśrama.

In the *Ānanda Rāmāyaṇa* it is stated that Gautama took possession of Ahalyā after going round the two-faced cow (*Dvimukhī Gā*) in

pradakṣiṇa. When a cow brings forth the calf, the head of the cow will be one side while the head of the calf will be facing the opposite direction. Ahalyā becoming a rock and Indra becoming a *Sahasrākṣa* are also there in the *Ānanda Rāmāyaṇa*. Another version is also found in the same work in which it is stated that when Ahalyā was flowing like a river, Rāma pulled her up while he was residing in the forests.

In the *Padmapurāṇa* Ahalyā attaining the state of a rock due to Gautama's curse is mentioned.

We find the Ahalyā's episode in the ancient work Vātsyāyana's *Kāmasūtras* (A.D. Second century) also in which the illicit relationship that Ahalyā had with Indra is described. Jayamaṅgaḷa, the commentary on Vātsyāyana's *Kāmasūtras* furnishes a strange story about Ahalyā, the source of which is not to be traced. The story runs as follows :

Indra loves Ahalyā, goes to Gautama's *āśrama* and enjoys in her company. Gautama comes back to the *āśrama*. Then Ahalyā, knowing that her husband has come, conceals Indra in her womb (*garbha*). Gautama goes along with his wife, Ahalyā, to the hermitage of another sage who invited him for dinner. The sage came to know about the presence of Indra also at that place with the help of his yogic vision (*Yoga netra*) and orders that three seats are put. Gautama suspects and learning about the secret, curses Ahalyā. Indra was henceforth called *Ahalyājārā* – A lustrous person who had illegal connection with Ahalyā. The source from which the commentator got the version is not known.

We have reference to this episode in some of the Sanskrit dramas also. The *Mṛcchakaṭika* refers to this in the following lines :

‘*Yadvad ahalyā hetoḥ mṛṣāvadasi Śakra Gautamo'smīti*’

The following line in the *Prabodhacandrodaya* also mentions about this :

‘*Ahalyāyaijārās surapatir abhūt*’

Thus both Ahalyā and Indra were targets of ridicule for long through ages. But there are a few *Purāṇas* which mention some good things also about the family life of Ahalyā and Gautama. The *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* is one such. Brahmā created Ahalyā to excel in beauty even the most beautiful Mohinī. She was engaged in doing service to the sage, Gautama. Indra and the other *devas* intended to marry her. They were competing with each other to win her hand. Brahmā stipulated a condition to them that whoever went round the earth first, he would have her as his wife. Indra and the other *devas* were racing with each other. Gautama went round the sacred cow in *pradakṣiṇa* and said that it was equal to going round the earth. Ahalyā became

his wife and she lived a happy life with him. In *Purāṇas* like *Śiva*, *Brāhma* and *Varāha* the greatness of Gautama was described at length. When there was a dreadful famine in the country, both Ahalyā and Gautama fed the people and rescued them from the horrors of the drought. The other sages and brahmins were envious of the couple. They created a fake cow and made it graze in the Gautama's *āśrama*. It died there. The brahmins found fault with Gautama for having killed the sacred cow. In order to get rid of the sin that he committed in causing the death of the sacred cow, Gautama made Gaṅgā to descend on earth. Gaṅgā was henceforth called Gautamī. It was also called Godāvarī as it made the cow to come to life again. In the *Āśvamedha parva* of the great *Mahābhārata*, Udaṅka is stated to be the disciple of Gautama and married their daughter. He also strived hard to secure the ear-rings of Madayantī, which, his *guru's* wife, Ahalyā, wished to have.

AHALYĀ'S EPISODE IN TELUGU LITERATURE

The *Rāmāyaṇa* has been rendered into Telugu by many a great poet and is still being rendered into it, many in an elaborate manner, while a few are in an abridged form. Ahalyā's episode finds a place in all these works.

The episode that is found in the *Bālakāṇḍa* of the *Bhāskara Rāmāyaṇa* (twelfth century) has its origin in the *Vālmiki Rāmāyaṇa*. Though it deviates slightly in mentioning about Ahalyā's state of lying like a rock, it faithfully follows the original in all other aspects. The *Raṅganātha Rāmāyaṇa* (thirteenth century) seems to aim at pleasing the public sentiment as its great hero, Rāma, does. We find two versions of the episode in this work, one in the *Bālakāṇḍa* and the other in the *Uttarakāṇḍa*. In the version that is found in the *Bālakāṇḍa*, we have all that that we find in *Vālmiki Rāmāyaṇa*. Besides, we have two more additions in it. It mentions about Indra's crowing in the Gautama's *āśrama* in the guise of a cock and also Ahalyā's state of lying like a rock in the hermitage. The story that is found in the *Uttarakāṇḍa* of this work is quite different and will be dealt with at length, later. Kummari Molla (sixteenth century) described the story in a very brief manner, that too in three verses. She did not even mention the name of Ahalyā. She merely said that a beautiful lady appeared before them when the dust in the foot of Rāma touched a rock. The *Dvipada-rāmāyaṇa* of Kaṭṭā Varadarāja Kavi followed the story that is found in the *Bālakāṇḍa* of Vālmiki. But here too, Ahalyā becomes a rock due to the curse of Gautama. It will not be out of place if we make a mention about two *Rāmāyaṇas* that were written in the present century. One of them is the *Yathā Vālmiki Rāmāyaṇa* of Vāvilikolanu Subba Rao who is known as Āndhra Vālmiki. In the *Uttarakāṇḍa* of his work,

he cleverly avoided Ahalyā's state of lying like a rock as is found in its counterpart of Vālmiki. Perhaps he might have thought that it was a later interpolation. Thus he succeeded in achieving a similarity of events in the stories of the *Bālakāṇḍa* and the *Uttarakāṇḍa*. The other work that is worth mentioned here is the *Rāmāyaṇa Kalpavṛkṣamu* of Kavisamrāt Viśvanātha Satyanārāyaṇa, the Jñānapīṭh award winner of 1971. He tried in his renowned work to achieve a harmonious blending of the versions that are found in both *Bāla* and *Uttarakāṇḍas* of Vālmiki. While he followed the ancient poets in describing the story, he gave due consideration to the popular tradition also. His own creations are also there. He described the story in the *Ahalyākhaṇḍa* of his work in sixty verses.

Just like one puts on a *pītāmbhara*, the golden garment, while going to a liquor shop, Indra while going to meet Ahalyā puts on the guise of the sage. Ahalyā recognises him to be Indra, the lord of heavens. She asks him to get out of the *āśrama* and tells him that it is dangerous for both if Gautama happens to see them. Indra was all in lust. He could not control himself. He begged of her to give him her company. She too developed a fanciful love towards him and so her desire too flared up. But she asked him 'Is this the proper time for it? It is not dawn. Has the cock crowed?' Indra caught the clue. He went back very happily, only to come again in the dawn. He was waiting with great difficulty for the night to pass. But he was impatient as the time was pacing so slowly. He crowed like a cock in the Gautama's *āśrama*. Gautama came out of the hermitage. He saw Indra standing before him at the gate looking very pale like the reflection in a soiled mirror. Gautama knew his intention and cursed both Indra and Ahalyā. The poet cleverly avoided any sexual intercourse to happen between Ahalyā and Indra. They were cursed only for their impurity of thought and speech. Gautama's character is depicted in a most superb manner in this work.

The *Uttarakāṇḍa* of the *Rāmāyaṇa* was separately rendered into Telugu by a few poets and it was named as *Uttara Rāmāyaṇa*. The poet who dealt with it first, was Tikkana (thirteenth century) and he dispensed with Ahalyā's episode in only one verse. Kaṅkaṇṭi Pāpa Rāja Kavi, though followed Vālmiki's version to a great extent, did give credence to the popular version also in his *Uttara Rāmāyaṇa*. In his work, Indra crows like a cock in the midnight and putting on the guise of Gautama he meets Ahalyā in her hermitage, while Gautama was away to the river thinking that it was dawn. Gautama came back and cursed Indra that he would be taken a captive by his enemy and thus his pride of valour would be subdued. He cursed Ahalyā that she would lie like a rock.

Thus Ahalyā's episode was described at length by several poets. Except in a few, with regards to some minor details, the story is the same. But we find quite a new and strange version in the *Uttarakāṇḍa* of the *Raṅganātha Rāmāyaṇa*, the source of which is not quite familiar. The version that is found in that part of the work is as follows:

Brahmā created the most beautiful lady, Ahalyā. The lords of the eight directions wished to marry her. But she was given in marriage to Gautama. Indra tried to win her love and succeeded in his attempt to have sexual intercourse with her. Knowing about this, Gautama cursed Indra that he would become a *Sahasrākṣa*, a person with thousand eyes. He was equally angry with his wife, Ahalyā and would have burnt her to ashes with his curse, but for the intervention of Brahmā. Brahmā came to her rescue. He asked Gautama to excuse her mistakes twice, in due regard to his elderly advice. Gautama had to heed to the advice of Brahmā, his own father-in-law. The great Vāli was born to Ahalyā by Indra. Some years have passed. In due course Añjanā was born to both Ahalyā and Gautama. When Ahalyā bathed after menstruation, she was all beautiful. The Sun-God casted his eye on her and wooed her. She reciprocated his love. On learning about this, Gautama cursed the Sun-God to be devoured by Rāhu every time there was an eclipse. He excused the sinful act of Ahalyā for the second time also in accordance with the word given to Brahmā. Sugrīva was born to Ahalyā by the Sun-God. Indra's desire to have Ahalyā gained momentum once again. He came again. This time he crowed like a cock. Gautama went to Ganges, thinking that it dawned. Indra went into the hermitage and enjoyed in the company of Ahalyā. The little girl, Añjanā, who was in the hermitage reported to her father, Gautama, on his arrival what had happened in the āśrama during his absence. Gautama cursed Indra that he would be deprived of his testicles and as a result, by the replacement of the same by those of a goat he became *Meṣarīṣaṇa*. Ahalyā was cursed to lie like a rock in the āśrama.

The same version as above is found in the *Vicitra Rāmāyaṇa* by Gopīnātha Kavi also. In the *Samīrakumāravijaya*, a contemporary work to the above, the above version is described at length in the most beautiful manner.

A poet, by name Dharanīdēvula Rāmamantri, in his work called *Daśavatāracaritra* described the story of Rāma, one of the avatāras of Lord Viṣṇu. But he utilised the major part of his *Rāmācarita* to describe the love episode of Ahalyā and Indra. It appears as if he has written Rāma's story, only to describe Ahalyā's episode. Such was the prominence that was given to the Ahalyā's story by him in his *Rāmāvatāracaritramu*.

The Telugu poets who wrote works of erotic sentiment tried to create opportunities for themselves to refer to the illegal relationship of Ahalyā and Indra. In the *Kriḍābhīrāma* of the great poet Śrīnātha, the cocks were addressed as *Ahalyājāra yabhana hetuvulāra!* - which means 'O! cocks! who made possible for Indra to have sexual intercourse with Ahalyā'.

Ahalyā is the most important character in *Rāmāyaṇa* and she occupies a most significant place also in it. The great monkey-kings Vāli and Sugrīva, Śatānanda, the royal purohit of the sage-king Janaka who played a prominent role in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, were the sons of Ahalyā. Āṇjaneya, the great hero of *Rāmāyaṇa* was Ahalyā's grandson through Āṇjanā.

The story of Ahalyā referred to in the Vedas took a concrete shape in the *Rāmāyaṇa* of Vālmīki and gradually grew into prominence in the middle ages with different versions. During the Madurai Nāyak period, an independent work by name *Ahalyāsaṅkrandanamu* was written with the love episode of Ahalyā and Indra as its theme by Samukhaṃ Veṅkaṭa Kṛṣṇappa Nāyaka, a general-poet who flourished in the court of Vijaya-raṅga Cokkanātha (eighteenth century). It is a work of three cantos and is mostly erotic, quite in tune with the social conditions of his times.

The following is the summary of the story that is described in the poem in three hundred and fifty verses.

King Janamejaya puts a question to Vaiśampāyana thus: Ahalyā was Gautama's wife. How did it happen that she loved Indra? How was she released from the curse of her husband? Vaiśampāyana tried to explain in reply to his question and narrated to him the love story of Ahalyā and Saṅkrandana.

Indra was having his court in Sudharmā in the great city of Amarāvati. Devas, the lords of the eight directions, sages, cakravartins, divine damsels and many others were there in the court. He put a question in the assembly to tell him who was the most beautiful and talented among the damsels that assembled there. Everybody pleaded in his own way and there was conflict of opinions. They could not decide and left the decision to Indra himself. Indra, in turn, told them that Brahmā alone was competent in the matter and took them all to him to have the doubt cleared. Brahmā asked Indra the reason for their arrival. On knowing about the reason of their arrival he told them that he was not satisfied with them all and substantiated his statement with his arguments. Then he created the most beautiful lady on earth with

all the good elements drawn from things of his own creation. It was Ahalyā. The *devas* were all in appreciation of her beauty. Indra wanted to have her for himself. But Brahmā turned down his request and put her in the care of Gautama in whose steadfastness he had much confidence. Ahalyā was taken to Gautama's *āśrama* and she was engaged in the service of the great sage. Indra returned to Amarāvati with all his retinue and he was all in love with Ahalyā. He suffered much from the pangs of separation for her. After some time Brahmā, having been pleased much with the steadfastness and strong will of Gautama, gave Ahalyā in marriage to him. But Ahalyā was loving Indra in her heart of hearts from the day that she saw him. She envied the fortune of Śacī to have the great Indra as her husband. Her mind was wavering between *dharma* and *adhrama*. She could not decide about the right path. Indra, on the other hand, could not bear the separation in spite of many remedies and came to Gautama's *āśrama* to have some solace. He was making frequent visits in the pretext of paying respects to the great sage. When Gautama was away from the *āśrama* Indra came there and made some advances. Ahalyā's desire for Indra came to the uppermost of her heart and she reciprocated his love. They had a conversation in which they exchanged their love with each other and they could not venture further. After a few days a lady-messenger, *Yoginī*, came from Indra. She met Ahalyā in the *āśrama* and described Indra's sorrowful state on account of her separation and explained the extent of love that he had for her. She also described the greatness of Indra. She pleaded that Gautama was not at all a suitable match for her. Ahalyā first pretended to convince her that she was not that type of a woman, but the *Yoginī* was not disheartened. She tried further to convince her. She told that Indra was her natural husband from the time of her birth and proved it on the strength of the *mantras*, chanted at the time of marriage. Ahalyā yielded to her pressures. The *Yoginī* prepared the ground for Indra's further advancements and went back to Indra to report to him the success of her mission. That night, Gautama was resting on the bed. Ahalyā was raging with passion. Under the pretext of pressing his feet she scratched him with her nail indicating to him her desire. But Gautama reminded her that the menstrual period was already over and that it was a sin to indulge in sex. She was much disappointed and thought for a while that Indra would have satisfied her desire better knowing her mind. Indra thought that he could not have his desire fulfilled if he did not venture. He came to the *āśrama* and rowed like a cock. Gautama went to the Ganges. Indra entered the *āśrama* in the guise of the sage. Ahalyā suspected that somebody else had come there in her husband's guise. Indra made her understand that it was he that stood before her in that guise. They had sexual intercourse to their full satisfaction. Indra took leave of her and was coming out of the *āśrama*. When Gautama came back and knowing

about his sinful act, he cursed him that he would be deprived of his testicles. Ahalyā came there with water to wash his feet. He refused to have anything from her and cursed that she would lie like a rock in the *āśrama*. She fell on his feet and begged pardon of him. Gautama, out of compassion towards her, told that she would be released of her curse when the dust in the sacred feet of Rāma touched the rock and he left for Himālayas. After a long time, Rāma came to the *āśrama* on the way to Mithilā along with Viśvāmitra and Lakṣmaṇa and Ahalyā was released from the curse and stood before him. Gautama also came there. Rāma bowed to them. Gautama sang in praise of Rāma with devotion. Ahalyā and Gautama lived happily the rest of their life.

Indra holding the court in Sudharmā and discussing about the most beautiful lady on the earth, the introduction of a new character, *Yogini*, to mediate between them, Indra's calculated attempts to have his desire fulfilled and the description of their pangs of separation are innovations found in this work.

The *Ahalyāsankrandanavilāsa* of Saṅgamēśvara Kavi which came later was satisfied with the description of their love only and did not make any mention of the curses that they had and their redemption. There are a few *Yakṣagānas* (Operas) also which describe this episode. Ahalyāsankrandana nāṭaka of Nādeḷḷa Puruṣottama Kavi and another of Pinagaṇḍla Rāma Kavi are also to be mentioned in this connection. The *Yakṣagāna* by name '*Indrāhalyāvilāsam*' by Dharaṇikōṭṭa Subrahmaṇya Kavi is a famous work of this theme. It seems that there is a Sanskrit drama also by name *Ahalyāsankrandana*, but it is not available.

In the Ahalyā's episode of the *Rāmāvatāra caritam*, otherwise known as *Kamba Rāmāyaṇa* in Tamil, the great Kamban tried to make amends to the characterisation of Ahalyā. He had high esteem to the chastity of women and so he treated Ahalyā's character in a different manner. Indra was in love with Ahalyā. He came to Gautama's *āśrama* in the guise of the sage. She never suspected and took him to be Gautama, her husband himself. He made advances towards her and succeeded in having sexual intercourse with her. She noticed in the course that he was not her husband, but Indra, the lord of heavens. As soon as she knew about it, she realised the wrong done to her and she swooned. Then Gautama came and cursed both of them. Kamban here cleverly managed to depict Ahalyā as a spotless character unlike in *Vālmiki's Rāmāyaṇa* where it was mentioned that she too loved Indra and willingly accepted his advances resulting in sexual intercourse.

It will not be out of place if we mention here about a few attempts made in modern times also based on the theme of Ahalyā's

love episode. One such is a short story in Tamil by name *Tōlvi*¹ by Dr. G Sundaramūrti.

Ahalyā, after she has been released from the curse, had high esteem towards Viśvāmitra because he was the person who brought Rāma to the *āśrama*. If he had not brought him there and narrated the sad plight of Ahalyā on account of the curse, Ahalyā would not have attained her original form and found a place by the side of her husband, Gautama. She used to celebrate the day every year on which she got the release from the curse. It was her practice to go to Viśvāmitra's *āśrama* on that day and pay respects to him and receive his blessings. Many years have passed. One year it so happened that she came there as usual and took leave of him after paying respects to him. A disciple in the *āśrama* asked Viśvāmitra why she was doing like that. Viśvāmitra told him what all happened in the past and remarked 'Poor lady! she is thinking that I have brought Rāma out of compassion towards her sad plight and I was mainly instrumental for the release of her curse. But my intention was different. It was on account of the love I had towards Sītā I did all that. I knew even then that Sītā would be ridiculed by people for her short stay in Rāvaṇa's place and Rāma, in order to please the public, might abandon Sītā on that score. I did not want that situation to occur. If Rāma excused Ahalyā for her sinful act and accepted her as a devoted chaste woman, I thought that he would certainly not mind the blame cast on Sītā who was blemishless and abandon her recollecting Ahalyā to his mind. It was only with that intention in mind that I took Rāma to Gautama's *āśrama*'. In the meantime a disciple came running to the *āśrama* and conveyed the news that Rāma has abandoned Sītā giving credence to the loose and baseless talk of the public about Sītā's character. On hearing this alarming news, Viśvāmitra was stunned and the short story ends dramatically. He exclaims that his attempt was defeated. *Tōlvi* in Tamil means defeat. All that, that he tried to avoid such a situation in Rāma's life, was of no avail and his attempt was bitterly defeated. He accepts fate and remarks that it cannot be altered however mighty one is.

In a recent Tamil picture, *Aval*, Ahalyā's episode finds a place incidentally and in that, Ahalyā, though submitting herself to the curse, expresses her mind in the context. She seems to represent the modern woman with independent views who does not submit to fate for her sufferings. When Gautama cursed her to become a rock, she says that she was all along a rock only and in no way better. She asks her husband. 'O! Sir! you are a great seer. Could you not realise that

1. 'Tōlvi' published in *Kadambam* (October, 1961).

I was not treated as I should? Could you not know my passion and my desire? You are finding fault with me. I did not err in any manner. When Indra came in your guise I thought that you have come to me. I never suspected that an untoward thing would befall on me. You, being a seer, why could you not know that it was not yet dawn and Indra crowed like a cock to make you quit the *āśrama*? You could have known what would happen in future and tried to avoid it. You have allowed the circumstances to develop and you are now find fault with me and subjected me to the effects of the curse. What fault is there in me? She questioned vehemently for which Gautama had no answer. She submitted herself to the fate and became rock in the *āśrama*.

There is a view that the story of Ahalyā is nothing but an allegorical interpretation of Nature's manifestation. In one of such explanations, it is stated that Ahalyā means the night or darkness. Indra is the Sun-God. Gautama is the Moon. The darkness is wedded to the Moon and the Sun has snatched away the darkness from the Moon. Kumārila Bhaṭṭa furnishes this interpretation. Maxmuller also accepts this view. There is another explanation. Ahalyā means unploughed or barren land. It yielded in fruit due to the contact with Indra, the Rain-God. Mīmāṃsakās hold this view. According to Veda Bhāṣya, Ahalyā is the *Vāk* or speech. Indra is the person responsible for the evolution of speech. These explanations tend us to believe that it is no more a story of erotic sentiment depicting the illicit relationship, but a symbolic story described to manifest the events of nature.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. *Ahalyāsaṅkṛandanamu* :
Pub: Srīngaragrandha Mandali.
2. *Introduction to Ahalyāsaṅkṛandanamu* :
Pub: Emesco, Madras.
3. *Pūrvagāthālahari* :
by V. Sreenivasa Rao.
4. *Rāmāvatāracaritam* :
(Tam): Kambar.
5. *Tōlvi* : (short story) .
by Dr. G. Sundaramurthy, M.A., Ph.D

D SATYANARAYANA

PAÑCASIKHA

Pañcasikha is a great name in Indian philosophical literature. He is referred to with great deference in *Sāṃkhya Yoga Pāñcarātra* Buddhist and Jain literature. Throughout the *Mahābhārata* he is referred to as *bhikṣu* or *bhikku*. The term *bhikṣu* in Sanskrit literature is generally applied to Buddhist monks.

If Rāmānuja, Madhva, Nimbārka and Vallabha all drew from the same source to emphasize their theistic philosophy, we can unhesitatingly say Mīrā, the mellifluous singer of the Lord, Sūrdās, the devotee with stringed flute, Jayadeva, the poet par excellence and author of the *Gītāgovinda* and Caitanya, the preacher of intense and mystifying devotion in dance, all drew their inspiration from Pañcasikha, the earliest of the Pāñcarātra experts. Nārada, another Pāñcarātra exponent, was a metaphysician of repute and equally famous as a musician. The tuft of hair is an individual characteristic which the modern cinemas have associated with Nārada to a profane level. Pañcasikha, of course, means having five tufts of hair. As a musician, the name Nārada is well-known. Pāñcarātra and music go together with Nārada and Pañcasikha. Both were experts at *vina*.

In the *Sonakajātaka* he has been referred to as an instrument in contacting Arindama and Sonaka. The *Sonakajātaka* states thus — Sonaka and Arindama completed their studies at Taxila. While coming back home they had to stay at Vāranaṣi. The rājapurohita or royal chaplain conferred kingship upon Arindama, the king being shortly dead. Arindama entered the palace and forgot all about his friend Sonaka. Pañcasikha or Pañcacūla got them together again.

In the *Sakkapāṇkhyasūta* (*Dīghanikāya* II p. 263) a fuller account is given. Pañcasikha was a favourite of the Buddha (*Sumaṅgala-*

vilāsini. III. 699). In the *Pañcaśikhasutta*, he visits, the Buddha and asks how some men are emancipated in this birth and some are not?

There are stray references available about the life of Pañcaśikha both in Pāli and Sanskrit literature. He belonged to the *Gandhabba* or the *Gandharva* class, it is confirmed by both Pāli and Sanskrit sources. Gandharvas are good at music in Sanskrit literature which Pāli sources also corroborate.

From Sanskrit sources it is gathered that Pañcaśikha would incarnate in the Varṣakalpa as Śiva. He was one among those who marched against Tripurāsura. He was a disciple of Āsuri and Kapila and belonged to Parāśara gotra. He was a fellow-pupil of Jaiṣṭhavya, a famous Sāṃkhya commentator. He was a Pāñcarātra religious leader and gave religious and philosophical instructions to Janaka, the king of Videha, who became emancipated. He is also an expert in *daharavidyā*. Sometimes, he is said to be born from the navel base of Brahma and identified with Kapila, the founder-teacher of Sāṃkhya. He is said to be a yoga expert. His views have been referred to by most of the commentators on *Yoga*, *Sāṃkhya* etc. The *Vāmanapurāṇa* says that he was the son of Himsā, wife of Dharma. He was omniscient and none could gain a victory over him in logic. He knew all the schools of renunciation.

From Buddhist sources, it is known that Pañcaśikha was a good player at vīṇa. He could compose beautiful love-songs. He was in love with *Bhaddasuriyavaccasa*, a daughter of the *Gandhabba Timbaru*. The poem composed by him in love and dedicated to her moved even the Buddha. To Buddha he confessed that he was in love but his fiancée had rejected therefore, and hence disappointed. She favoured Śikhāṇḍī, the son of Mātali. She was cajoled. Beautiful songs composed and sung also moved her and she finally consented to get wedded to Pañcaśikha. At this occasion Buddhaghōṣa says (*Sumaṅgalavilāsini*. II. 704) in the *Mahāgovindasutta* that the *Sakka* pronounced his eight-fold eulogy of Buddha. *Sakka* also blessed the marriage.

The names Śikhāṇḍī and Mātali are also well-known in Sanskrit literature. In the Pāñcarātra literature the name Śikhāṇḍī or Citraśikhāṇḍī is referred to with great reverence. In the *Mahābhārata* (*Śānti*. 343.30.) Citraśikhāṇḍī is a collective name of seven sages. The name Mātali and Śikhāṇḍī also occur in the *Mahābhārata*. Mātali is the charioteer of Indra. Śikhāṇḍin was a purohit of Dālbyha (*Kauṣītaki brāhmaṇa*, 7.4).

In Pāli sources he is said to be an incarnation of Sanankumāra. Pañcaśikha and Pañcaśikha are identified. In the *Janavasabhasutta*

(Dīgh. II. 211) and *Mahāgovindasutta* (D. II. 230). Sanankumāra appeared before the assembly of gods of *Tavatimsa* and materialised himself and assumed the form of Pañcaśikha. Buddhaghōṣa says (*Sumaṅgalavilāsini* II. 640) that all the Devas loved Pāñcaśikha and wished to resemble him. Sanankumāra is said to be known as Pañcacūḷa in his earlier births in the human form when he practised *jhāna*

Sanatkumāra in Sanskrit literature is too well-known. Sanatkumāra is also too well-known as leading amongst the earliest Pāñcarātra leaders. Aniruddha is also identified with Pañcaśikha (*Jātaka* V. 412). In the *Bilarakoṣīyajātaka*, Ānanda is said to have been born as Pañcaśikha (*Jātaka* IV. 69).

Bhavaḡaṇeṣa, a Sāṃkhya commentator of repute has quoted a couplet in the name of Pañcaśikha :-

Pañcaviṃṣati tattvajñō yatratairāśrama sthitaḥ |
Jaṭi munḍi śikhī vāpi mucyate nātra saṃśayaḥ ||

One who is aware of twenty five primary categories living in whatever religious discipline obtains salvation whether he is growing full hair on his head, clean shaved or having tufts of hair. Pañcaśikha is one having five knots of hair at his head. One way of insulting a man (*Sumaṅgalavilāsini*. 1.296) was to shave his head leaving five locks of hair.

In the Sāṃkhya hierarchy it is stated that Pañcaśikha was a student of Āsuri who in turn was a student of Kapila. (*Māṭhara Sāṃkhya-saptati* 72). It is well-known that the town Kapilavastu was founded to honour this sage Kapila. Sometimes Pañcaśikha is also called incarnation of Kapila who in turn is called the fifth incarnation of Viṣṇu, eighth being the Buddha.

Sanaka, Sananda, Sanātana, Āsuri, Kapila, Vodu and Pañcaśikha are the seven primary teachers.

The *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* (6.5. 2-3), gives a different lineage of gurus, Upaveśi, Aruṇa, Uddālaka, Yājñavalkya, Āsuri and Pañcaśikha. The fact that Pañcaśikha was a disciple of Āsuri is confirmed in both the sources (*Vāyu*. 101. 338). The *Satapathabrāhmaṇa* gives Āsuri's views on sacrifice and the nature of the ultimate as determinate or indeterminate.

The name of Pāñcaśikha is also available in the *Baudhāyana Gṛhya*, 2.4.17 and Āpastamba. 43.3.7 and 40.2.9.

Corresponding to the Pāli name Pañcacūḷa, the Sanskrit name is Pañcacūḍa and referred to profusely in many *Śrauta* and *Gṛhya* works. In the *Maitrāyaṇi Kāṭhaka* and *Kapisthala* also the name Pañcacūḍa is found.

Pañcaśikha is a great name in *Sāṃkhya* and *Yoga*. He is said to be the author of a huge work having sixty thousand verses. This work is known as *Tantrāṇi* or *Śaṣṭitantram*. The book is lost but some quotations in prose and verse are available.

Vācaspati, the famous commentator on all branches of philosophy has used the name of Varṣaganya and Pañcaśikha. Confusingly thereby making a few scholars to opine that Pāñcarātra and Varṣaganya were identical as both belonged to Parāśaragotra.

His philosophy in a nutshell is "equality to all beings, dispassionate attitude, non-attachment as the highest good for the men". Janaka abandoned the hundred teachers and followed his views.

In the *Mahābhārata* he is also called *cirañjivīn* – living for eternity (*Śānti*. 220. 10). The *Vāyu*. 23.41 speaks of him among the *yogis* of the Māheśvara school.

He is a great Sāṃkhya teacher. According to him *avidyā* has five facets (*Buddhacaritra*. XII. 33; *Sāṃkhyakārikā* 47). In the *Śvetāśvalāśia* it is said of five projecting telescopic joints. In the introduction to the *Uttarājñhayana sūtra*, Charpentier refers to the lists of subjects as given there four *Vedas*, *Itihāsa*, *Nighaṇṭu*, *Vaidka-angas* and the *Śaṣṭitantra*. By this it can be inferred that the *Śaṣṭitantra* was a discipline in itself.

He recommended *jñānakarmasamuccayavāda* or the combined method of knowledge and action. This philosophy of *jñānakarma samuccaya* is an old school of thought prevalent even before Śaṅkara.

E.H. Johnson in his book the 'Early Sāṃkhya' expresses that *Sāṃkhya* and *Yoga* were only two facets of the same school represented by Pañcaśikha and *Varṣaganya* as the philosophy was current in the first century A.D. Sometimes pure metaphysics is called *Sāṃkhya* and the physical and the sensory control activities undertaken to achieve are called *Yoga*.

Keith (p. 48 of *Sāṃkhya*) maintain that Pañcaśikha was the author of the *Śaṣṭitantra*. This is not the name of a book but a school of thought. The opinion on sixty topics of that school has been collected in that school.

In the *Garuḍapurāṇa* Kapila is called *Siddheśa*, lord of the Siddhas. Siddhas are a class like Gandharvas. In Buddhist literature, Pañcaśikha is told as *Ganobabba*.

Vijñānabhikṣu, criticising an advaitin in the *Ṣaḍadhyāyibhāṣya* says that there were two Kapilas. In the *Śvetāśvatara*. 5.2, Ānandagiri also maintains that there are two Kapilas one *Vaidika* and the non-*Vaidika*. Prahlāda's son is also named Kapila. There is one Dharmaśāstra author also by the name Kapila. Viśvāmitra's son and the author of an *upapurāṇa* also are named Kapila.

Pañcaśikha's association with Kapila is so intense that he is very often Kāpileya. The name of Āsuri's wife was also Kapilā. From her name also the name Kāpileya is derived. The chapter 211 in the *Mahābhārata* verse 25.28 contains the philosophy to free from pleasure and pain, old age and death resembling very closely the Four Noble Truths. In *Śānti*. 306.56-66, there is a long list of teachers. Viśvāvasu tells Yājñavalkya how he learnt the twenty five tattvas from seventeen teachers. Among the others Pañcaśikha and Gautama are also named.

Gautama may not be the name of Gautama the Buddha. There is another Nyāya philosophy teacher Gautama. But this statement represents a tradition. In *Śānti*. (Chap. 307) Yudhiṣṭhira asks Bhīṣma who reproduces the dialogue between Janaka and Pañcaśikha wherein Pañcaśikha said that none can escape old age and death by vedic rites and vitality restoring elixirs. Teachings of Pañcaśikha to Janaka can also be compared with the *Dhammapada* (200), *Uttarādhyayanāsūtra* (9.14).

Pañcaśikha's name thus is taken in Buddhist literature and also in the Sāṃkhya literature. It is to be remembered that Sāṃkhya system has been criticised by all the systems of orthodox philosophy. The earlier Sāṃkhya is divided into two sub-schools, the Śeṣvara Sāṃkhya and Nirīśvara Sāṃkhya i.e., the sub-school believing in God and the sub-school not believing in God. References to the name Pañcaśikha are also available in Jain literature. Mental state of perfect equilibrium of Janaka after Pañcaśikha's initiation is commonly available in Jain, Buddha and Hindu sources. Pañcaśikha was an expert in *daharavidyā*. The term *dahara* is explained in *Bhāgavata* 10.87.18, as the esoteric knowledge. In the *Agnipurāṇa* 382.4.5, his philosophy has been given as immune to worldly luxuries, constant introspection, ultimate good of the people (he undertook to make roads, dig wells etc.) Buddhist literature, equality throughout, non-attachment, these being his chief tenets. The *Bṛhadāranyaka-upaniṣad* (6.5.2-3) gives a line of teachers wherein the name Pañcaśikha appears. (Upaveśi, Aruṇa, Uddālaka, Yājñavalkya, Āsuri and Pañcaśikha). The *Vāyu*. 23.41 speaks of him

among the *yogis* of the Māheśvara school. The *Sānti*. 218.19 calls him expert in five philosophies *Pañcasrotasi*. Commenting on the *Yogasūtra* 1.4, Vācaspati has quoted views of Pañcaśikha stating that where animal sacrifice undertaken as a subsidiary and secondary action in a sacrifice there killing can be eliminated. Vijñānabhikṣu commenting on 1.24 of the *Yogavārttika* quotes conception of emancipation according to Pañcaśikha. The first stage of emancipation is knowledge and the second is being free from caprice and the third is total elimination. The *Buddhacaritra* (XII. 46.47) also quotes Pañcaśikha's views as representing Sāṃkhya. He is said to be the first pupil of Jaigīṣavya

In the *Vāmanapurāṇa* (Chapter 50) it is said that *Himsā* was the name of the wife of *Dharma* who delivered four sons, all the four being experts in *Yoga*. The eldest was Sanatkumāra, the second Sanātana, the third Sanaka and the fourth was Sanandana. All these saw that Pañcaśikha was expert in Sāṃkhya and knew *Yoga* fully. He was also a mendicant *taponidhi*. In the *Mahābhārata* he is also said as omniscient *sarvavit* and none could stand him in logic. He was fully conversant with all the schools of renunciation and fully knew the *tattvajñāna*.

F. Otto Schrader (Introduction to *Pāñcarātra* p 74) has emphasized connection between Buddhism and Sāṃkhya and also refers to one of his articles on the Śaṣṭitāntric in Z.C. M.G. 1914. It is to be remembered that Pañcaśikha was the author of the *Śaṣṭitantra*.

A story is given in the *Pādmaśāstra* (1.1) and *Viṣṇutilaka* (1.146). The first religion (*Pāñcarātra*, *Ādyadharmā*) being created and propagated by Śikhāṇḍin (Citraśikhāṇḍin), hell became naught and great decrease of creation took place (*Sṛṣṭi kṣayo mahān āsīt*). Brhman felt uneasy and went to the Lord who said that all the people are full of faith and therefore they go to the place of Viṣṇu and never return. There is now no hell or heaven, birth or death. So he with the help of Brahman, Kapila and Śiva created five more systems i.e., *Yoga*, *Sāṃkhya*, *Bauddha*, *Jaina* and *Śaiva* conflicting with each other and the *Pāñcarātra*. Thus *Pāñcarātra* and Buddhism and Sāṃkhya have been said to have the same origin and the term *Pañcāśvalāsi* should mean adept in *Yoga*, *Sāṃkhya*, *Bauddha*, *Jaina* and *Śaiva* schools of philosophy In XXXIII. 17 of the *Ahīrbudhnyā saṃhitā* the Lord is stated to be worshipped as Buddha by Buddhists.

Pañcaśikha thus points out to a pre-Buddhist period where various schools of thought were still in germinating form. Makkali Gosala and

others given in Pāli sources might be those whose views came in for strong criticism from Buddha. The views of Pañcasīkha may lead to build up a pre-upaniṣadic philosophy.

There is one undoubted factor that the Pañcasīkha was a great teacher and finds an honoured place in all the philosophical schools of India.

Dr. R S. BETAI.

THEFT IN DHARMAŚĀSTRA*

It is known that theft is considered to be one of the *Mahāpātakas* by Manu and all others. It is included under *kaṇṭakaśodhana* by Kauṭilya. It is treated as *kaṇṭakaśodhana* by Manu, Yājñavalkya and Nārada. Problem remains as to whether it is to be treated as an independent title or not and while Kauṭilya treats of it under *kaṇṭakaśodhana* without referring to it separately, Bṛhaspati refers to it under *sāhasa*. It is surprising that Viṣṇu gives a rather small treatment to it.

After assault, we naturally refer to theft. The title is treated after assault by Manu.¹ Yājñavalkya treats of it rather late and includes murder under it, probably because there could be many cases in which theft might also lead to murder.² It is to be noted that there is not writer in all the *smṛitis* who might have differentiated between theft and robbery as the Indian Penal Code has done.

It should be noted that in the treatment of this title, there are many interesting controversies in the commentators of Manu, and Yājñavalkya, Nārada, Bṛhaspati etc. also differ from Manu to a great extent. There are differing views on the question of inflicting corporeal punishment on the offenders in this title and there is quite an interesting difference of opinion with regard to the case of a thief who confesses his guilt. Manu has asked the thief to run to the king to confess his offence and be prepared to accept any punishment that is inflicted on him, we are told that he becomes purified when he accepts the punishment inflicted on him. We will do our best in the present treatment to clear these doubts away. We will also try to set up the theory of punishment of these authors and this make the title as clear as possible.

* A chapter from a project aided by the Gujarat University.

1. VIII. 301 onwards.

2. II. 230 to 237, 266 to 282.

Treatment in Manu

The following points are of interest in the long treatment that Manu gives to this title: -

(1) It is a matter beyond doubt that very great care is to be taken about tracing the thief, and making sure that he is the real culprit and then fixing up the nature of the offence and also its gravity, so that the real thief may be properly punished.³

(2) Unlike all other *smṛtikāras*, Manu uses several verses to stress the need of protecting the state from thieves and robbers. Theft is an offence that is to be put down with a very high hand and if the king fails to make his kingdom safe from thieves, robbers and murderers, he will meet his own sad end in this as also in the other life. The kingdom charges one-sixth of income on land as tax and also other taxes,⁴ he is *śaṣṭhāmsavṛti* as we are told in the *Śākuntala* of Kālidāsa⁵ and this taxation is meant for meeting the expenses of the state and for securing a safe and peaceful life for the subjects. That king therefore, who does not protect his subjects and yet charges these taxes is a thief himself. Manu makes the king entirely responsible for all the thefts that take place in the state, and wants the king to keep the subjects under proper restraint and he wants that the thieves and robbers shall always be evaded. Kauṭilya states that they are thorns and they shall be thrown out ruthlessly. The king has twofold duty, to protect the subjects and make them feel safe and secure in his rule and also to restrain and punish the enemies of public safety and to protect property that is a sacred trust.

With these two basic ideas in view, Manu lays down the following as the important points necessary for understanding the title of thefts:-

(i) The first thing that is to be noted is this. What does Manu understand by this title? Yājñavalkya includes murder etc. under this title. Nārada also expands its bounds. Bṛhaspati treats it only under the topic of robbery and violence. It seems that, according to Manu, theft and robbery both come under this title, while the rest will be treated separately under the title of *sāhasa*. He throughout the discussion deals with theft and robbery, and the latter often means stealth plus violence. Manu is conscious of the technical distinction between the two but pre-

3. Manu VIII. 302, 341, 342 etc.

4. VIII. 304, 308 etc.

5. *Ṣaṣṭhāmsavṛtterapi dharma eṣaḥ | and tapaḥ śaḍbhāgam akṣayyaṃ dadaty āraṇyakā hi naḥ |*

fers to include them under the same title and he mentions the other cases of violence only in a general way, in the next topic of *sāhasa*. Manu has therefore understood the meaning of the word quite rightly and he wisely treats it as a separate title deserving all the details unlike Bṛhaspati and even Yājñavalkya to some extent.

(ii) Another outstanding feature of the title is the consistency in which it is treated by Manu when he recommends again, discriminating punishments in accordance with the caste higher or lower. In the treatment of the previous two titles, we saw that he inflicts higher punishment on the Śūdra offenders. Here, the order is reversed and the rule is that higher the *varṇa* of the thief, graver the offence. Thus, the Brāhmaṇa thief will be the worst of the thieves. In his case it will naturally mean higher punishment than others, though of course no corporeal punishment will be given to him. In the opinion of Manu, as compared to the upper *varṇas*, the lower classes are habitually criminals, and Manu lays down the most appropriate punishment for them. But the interesting provision in Manu is that as theft is one of the worst of the offences, no member of the upper *varṇas*, that is, the *dvijas* should be found a criminal who resorts to this offence. As a result of this outlook he recommends higher punishment for offenders from the upper *varṇas*.

(iii) Real controversies arise when we have to distinguish between capital punishment and corporeal punishment. The commentators are not agreed in the matter. In verses VIII. 320 to 323, Manu refers to *vadha* as the punishment of a great store of grains, gold and silver, stealth of a thing more than hundred *palas* in weight and stealth of men and women etc. In these four verses the meaning of the word *vadha* needs to be properly understood. The word is used in the sense of corporeal and capital punishment both. To illustrate, in VIII. 322, it seems that the nature of the punishment is dependent upon the amount of the precious metal stolen. If it be one to fifty *palas*, there is fine; if it is fifty to hundred *palas*, there is corporeal punishment; while if it is more than hundred *palas*, the punishment is death because this stealth includes gems of high value and also human beings.

(iv) In VIII. 331, we have the word *sānvaya* which has created a headache. What does the word mean exactly? What is the punishment when a *sānvaya* deprives a man of his belongings? The word *niranvaya* which occurs in the same verse is interpreted as 'if there be no relation by friendly mutual dealing' by Medhātithi, and Kullūka understands it as 'one with whom there is absolutely no relation; even like staying in the same village'. It would be better and more exact to take the word in the sense of 'blood-relation', as Buhler has pointed out without ever stating his own opinion. The conclusion is that in case the thief is a

blood-relation of the man concerned there is lighter punishment for the offender.

(v) Manu has very clearly and exactly distinguished between robbery and theft. The *Mitākṣarā* rightly claims that in VIII. 332. Manu gives the definition of theft and robbery both and so, in the present context, when Manu is dealing with *steṇa*, it will mean and must mean 'robbery and theft both'. The peculiarity here is that the definition is given by the method of comparison. When goods are stolen in the presence of the owner and also his family, with or without violence, it is robbery; while it is an onset of theft when it is committed in secret or at night and so on. When however, an act of robbery is committed and denied, it is to be treated as theft. Thus, robbery is of two sorts—open robbery without violence and open robbery with violence. Theft is also of two types, concealed and open but denied in the court.

(vi) Yet one more important statement is that even the king is not beyond punishment for an act of theft or robbery in the wider sense of the term as above. The king must fine himself severely and throw away that money in water or else give it away to the Brāhmaṇas. The ideal which states that the offence of the king is hundred times more serious is an ideal of no mean value and this will naturally mean that the relations of the king will also suffer punishment if they commit this act. There is not, what we call the tyranny of the individual or a class. It is really unfortunate that the later writers have failed to stress this point.

(vii) Manu rather loosely exempts from punishment cases of theft of very ordinary things in a negligible quantity, as also things in small quality taken for sacrificial purposes.

The fundamental points lying at the root of these points are sound and genuine, and they will be able to add substantially even to the modern criminal law.

(1) The king is the highest authority in the state of Manu and still he wants the king to abide all the rules and laws that he inflicts on the subjects. Thus, if the king commits an act of theft, it is more serious than that committed by any other man. However, for him, only the punishment of fine is laid down. This will naturally mean self-imposed punishment.

(2) Theft is one of the gravest offences and so, punishment ranging from a small fine to the highest punishment of death are laid down. Crime and punishment go together and the punishment is to vary in accordance with the nature of the offence, value and nature of the article that is stolen, the amount of the goods and the manner of theft.

(3) Manu views theft very seriously and makes the men on power very much alert about it. Theft and robbery are a shame on the ruler and his police force and so, both are alerted challenged by Manu with spiritual punishment and loss of prestige etc.

(4) The next important law in Manu is this. Higher the status of the thief, higher his *varṇa* graver is the offence and more seriously should it be viewed by the king. The ideal is thought-provoking, noble and great.

To this, Yājñavalkya has added a few very important points that are as follows :-

(1) His view of the offence is as serious as that of Manu. He recommends a definite system of catching thieves, arrest on suspicion, alertness of the police-guards, detection of crime, consideration of the previous thefts at the time of punishment and so on.⁶ This clearly shows that Yājñavalkya takes greater interest in the method and manner of catching the thieves and punishing them rather than in the details of punishment.

(2) From the kings and the guards, the responsibility of catching the thieves is shifted to the village-headmen and the villagers. Yājñavalkya further alerts them by stating that there will be fines on the police-guards and the village-headmen, as also collective fines on the villages if they fail to catch the thieves in their areas.⁷ This is a very much important and a wise provision that makes all men conscious of the seriousness of the offence and the scrupulous care all are expected to take in the matter.

(3) In the list of the thefts, Yājñavalkya includes all the cases of pick-pocketing and purse-cutting and lays down heavy punishment for these. Thus, Yājñavalkya covers up many more cases of theft than Manu. This gives a more clear status to the offence and it is clearly in a state of evolution.

(4) Yājñavalkya further expands the title by including in it those also who help or shelter the thieves or sell stolen goods. Thus, merely an act of theft or murder is no criminal offence; even complicity in theft or murder, abetment is an offence of the same type almost.

The value of the provisions of Yājñavalkya can in no way be underestimated and we find a positive development in the provisions of the title of theft, in the manner of catching the offender, the manner of

6. II. 266 to 270.

7. II. 271 and 272.

his trial and punishment and so on, be more contribution of Yājñavalkya is that he has covered up many more offences of theft in his fine treatment.

To this, Nārada adds the following important points that go a long way in clarifying and elaborating Manu, more than improving upon him :-

We should, at the very commencement of our discussion on Nārada concede that only one manuscript of the *smṛti*, that from Nepal refers to the title of theft. As Jolly has already clarified, "The reading of several passages is uncertain and this circumstance, taken together with the want of a commentary, renders my translation less reliable than could be desired."⁸ Still, on the whole, a few points deserve particular note in this rather inexact treatment.

(1) In addition to the various ways of catching thieves and inquiring about their guilt as found in the *Yājñavalkya-smṛti*, Nārada shows the various ways in which confession can be extracted from the thieves, and these much about the various ways in which torture was made use of in those days. Manu does not refer to this.

(2) It is very much likely that a man might make a false statement about the stealth of his property. Nārada therefore recommends detection of the rightness of the claim and also oaths in all cases of thefts.

(3) If the real thief escapes and an innocent man is punished, the latter is to be paid double after the real thief is caught. This is a very important provision. The two provisions bring Nārada and with him the treatment of this title very much near to the Indian Penal Code.

(4) The harshness of the punishment of Manu is lessening and Nārada has recommended lighter punishment even for the stealth of a man, a woman or even a maiden.

It can thus be seen that, Manu is well detailed, clear and also fairly technical in his treatment of this title. His general principles are sound and well planned. He shows full knowledge of the requirements of the court-procedure, etc., and yet he maintains his great anxiety to uphold social morality, ethics, safety and protection of the subjects and so on. His harshness in punishments has also some ideas at the root and we cannot accuse Manu of primitive treatment or absence of applicability in courts etc., in these criminal titles. It should be noted that Manu has been much misunderstood in this title in particular.

The treatment in *Yājñavalkya* on the whole follows Manu but it goes a long way in elaborating Manu and he has also added a few valuable points to the treatment so that it becomes more technical and evolved and strictly legal.

We have also seen that *Yājñavalkya* is also detailed and technical in his own way though he follows Manu and yet recommends less strict punishment.

Viṣṇu

In regard to this offence, *Viṣṇu* has also a few points to add and with this, the title takes a more clear shape and it is better evolved. He has these important things in his treatment :-

(1) Most of the punishments in the matter of offences of theft are corporeal and this speaks for the seriousness of the offence and it also proves that private property as held was a sacred trust and in order to prevent the stealth of this in future, severest punishments are laid down. *Viṣṇu* is thus in like with the other *smṛtikāras* in regarding this offence as very grave.

(2) Even for stealing small things like grains, punishment is very harsh (V.79), ofcourse here is form of fine that is eleven times. and ofcourse restoring back the goods or its price stands (V.89-90).

(3) Rarer and greater the value of the thing stolen, higher the punishment, is the rule. Thus, for stealing animals like cow, horse etc., cutting off of the hand or foot is the punishment (V.77) and for stealing gold, silver, etc., the punishment is cutting off of both the hands (V.81). while for stealing gems that are bound to be rare, the punishment is highest amercement (V.87). Seriousness was there in the offence of stealth itself, but there was greater seriousness with the rarity and high price of the goods stolen.

(4) One interesting reference is to the retention of deposit, embezzling of goods, (V.169 and 167) and also to the claim of a deposit that was never deposited (V.171), and all these are cases of theft from the view point of *Viṣṇu* and are to be dealt with accordingly. This fine and interesting reference to indirect thefts would further suggest that in the opinion of *Viṣṇu* non-payment of king's taxes, smuggling of goods etc., as also sale of bad goods at a higher price etc., would be offences of theft. Some of these are referred to by *Kaṭīlyā*.

Viṣṇu thus continues his method and approach in case of this offence as he does in the case of other offences. He deals with them with a stern hand and lays down very severe punishments for these.

Bṛhaspati

Coming to Bṛhaspati, we find that he takes theft under the wide term *sāhasa* in which homicide or murder is also included. His treatment continues the harsh punishments of predecessors and he is for more harsh punishments for the thieves. He refers to some more offences of theft and again, he gives a fine classification of thieves. His treatment is interesting from the following points of view :—

(1) He classifies thieves into two types—open and concealed and states further that their sub-divisions can be a thousandfold (XXII.2). He then gives a list of open thieves (XXII.3 and 4) and a few cases of secret thieves (XXII.5). Then follow details of open thieves and how they are to be punished (XXII. 17). He is very harsh, almost ruthless on house-breakers (XXII.17) and he wants them to restore the stolen property and then to die by the various cruel methods of ending the life of the criminal

(2) In an interesting reference he states that when a man or woman is kidnapped, the offender is to die (XXII.18). Thus, unlike some of the *smṛtikāras* and unlike the Indian Penal Code, in the opinion of this *smṛtikāra*, kidnapping man or woman also amounts to theft and it is theft of the worst order. It is too well-known that the Indian Penal Code takes kidnapping as a separate offence.

(3) To Bṛhaspati, stealing of a cow is a very serious offence probably because cow is extremely holy and the offender who steals a cow is to be plunged in water with fetters on his body and after his nose is cut off (XXII.19). Bṛhaspati is far more harsh than Manu in that even for minor offences like stealing of grass, wood etc., there is corporeal punishment.

(4) When again, a religious man or a student of the *Vedas* steals he is to be kept in prison for long. He shall then be asked to restore the stolen property and also to undergo a penance. Such references are rare in the *smṛtis*, and Bṛhaspati is the second author to refer to imprisonment as punishment. The first author is Viṣṇu. This shows the general tendency of every *smṛtikāra* that follows to cover up as many offences of the same type as possible.

(5) Bṛhaspati next goes to the case of theft plus violence. He states that this offence of theft plus violence is three times more serious than ordinary theft and so, the punishment is also three fold (XXII. 23–24). In some cases of violence, the punishment is fivefold. (XXII–29).

It is thus clear that Bṛhaspati, who in normal course, gives far fewer details of these titles, gives quite a few and again interesting details of the offence of theft.

It can again be seen from this evolution how the title has developed and how every new *smṛtikāra* has remained anxious to make the title more detailed, more technical, more systematic and more legal. It always speaks for the fact that as days pass, *vyavahāra* in general and criminal law in particular are becoming more exact, and definitely evolved. We cannot give the entire credit of the evolution of this or any other title at that to either Manu or Nārada as some scholars might be inclined to do.

KAUṬILYA

A general study of the views of Kauṭilya on this title will be of great value and they will fill up some important gaps to be found in the treatment of theft in general and criminal law in particular. The following are the important things to be noted in the treatment of Kauṭilya :

(1) Kauṭilya does not define the title or give full details of punishment in the case of various thefts.

(2) He has not treated of this as an independent title. He takes it as a part of offences of murder, kidnapping, theft etc., that are treated in IV.6 and IV.8.

(3) He is more interested in the description of catching thieves, methods of investigation, methods of extracting confession and so on, all of which show how a criminal is to be caught and dealt with.

What Kauṭilya gives in (iii) above should be considered his valuable contribution to the evolution of the title and we get only a few stray and casual references about the rest.

When Kauṭilya deals with suspect-criminals, thieves, murderers etc., in IV.6.2 to 5, Kauṭilya concedes arrest on suspicion and he gives a long list of various suspicions. These can be principally divided into three types as under :

(1) Those who create suspicion by their facial expressions and external behaviour.

(2) Those who are probable habitual criminals and therefore on the list of the secret guards.

(3) Those who are probable criminals through inheritance of criminality.

It needs hardly to be added that the treatment of the subject is thoroughly scientific though brief.

Kautilya next turns to a detailed inquiry of the criminal. He wants the inquiry to be systematic, thorough and proceeding step by step. He lays down these as the steps in the matter of inquiry :

- (i) Arrest with article of thorough suspicion.
- (ii) Inquiry of dealers of the article to corroborate theft or otherwise.
- (iii) Questioning the person with whom the stolen article was found. There is to be interrogation of the probable accused in full details. Corroboration is always to be sought.
- (iv) The person who lost the article and has therefore complained is to be interrogated in details. This will eliminate false complaints as also false recognition of the article stolen. Here also corroboration is a must.
- (v) The person who runs away after stealth and is arrested is to be questioned. His claim to theoretical is any should be examined. Here also corroboration is a must.

(vi) Examining after recognizing an insider or outsider as thief.

(vii) Torture in proper limits when other means fail.

There are, besides these, a few very important provisions in Kautilya as follows :

(1) The method of interrogation and the evidence collected thereby is admissible only upto three days of the commital of the offence. Then it is inadmissible, the only exception in this being the finding of the tools of stealth.

(2) When it is proved that an innocent man has been charged with theft by some one, the person who so charges is to be treated as a thief. The other similar case is hiding the person who is a thief. In the modern sense, hiding the thief is abettment of the offence and the offence as a whole becomes cognizable.

(3) Kautilya lays down that even when the person who is interrogated is confused and prattling, he is to be taken as a suspect and not as a thief. If no corroboration is found, he is to be acquitted because confusion and prattling may be there through (a) fright, or (b) fear of torture. Thus, Kautilya specifically lays down that corroboration and full proof beyond doubt are necessary to punish an accused and interrogation and torture are only means to extract reality.

(4) One more deep thinking of Kautilya is with reference to torture. He accepts torture as a means of extracting truth from the

suspects. He lays down the types of torture. But he knows its dangers and therefore gives a detailed list of those who are not to be tortured and also lays down that under no circumstance should torture lead to death of the person tortured.

(5) He is specific about not putting brahmins to torture. But after doing this he lays down that when brahmins or ascetics are suspects, secret agents shall be placed on them to note their words and movements so that truth may come to light. He also states that when a brahmin deserves death, he is to be banished. He also lays down an alternative in punishing the brahmin with hard labour.

It can thus be seen that Kauṭilya in this particular title and in the title of murder is important for supplying the legal system and criminal procedure code unlike all smṛtikārās. This is his very important contribution.

ARATI MITRA

THE RHYME IN SANSKRIT LITERATURE

The term Rime¹ is closely associated with the word rhythm which is perhaps originated from the expression Ritimi and Rithmici versus²—a kind of accentual composition in the Middle Latin characterised by the identical terminal sound.

Rhyme has never been favoured by the conservative poets who took it with a derision in theory but not always in practice. This opinion holds true with the compositions of almost all the languages.

Sanskrit has got no commonly accepted term for rime. Early manuals are acquainted with the terms of two verbal artifices—*Yamakam* and *Prāsa*. But the highly artificial character of *yamaka* was conspicuous in the early concept of *ālāṅkāra* as it requires “*pṛihagyatna nīvartatā*”³, the criterion proposed by Ānandavardhana. “*prāyeṇa yamake citre rasapuṣṭir na dṛśyate*”. “*tattu naikāntamadhuṛam*”⁴, “*yamakānulomatadītaracakrādi⁵ bhido⁶ tirasa virodhinyah. Abhidhāna-mātra metat gaḍḍarikā pravāho vā*” — All of these *ālāṅkārikās* are agreed on the point that *yamaka* in no way accessary to *Rasa*. In spite of fact this artifice as *śabdālāṅkāra* got an elaborate treatment from the age of Bharata.

-
1. “Rime is more correctly spelled as rime from provincial work rim, its customary English spelling is the result of confusion with rhythm” — *Encyclopaedia Britanica*, Vol. XIX, pp. 271, 1965.
 2. *The English Dictionary* — Murray Vol. VIII, p. 685.
 3. *The Dhvanyāloka* — P. 222. Vṛtti on III. 17. KSS. 135.
 4. *The Kāvya-darśa* I. 61. Ed. Ananta Lal Thakur 1957.
 5. *The Kāvya-nuśāsa vṛtti* on 5/4. Vol. I. Hemacandra, p. 307. Ed. Rasik Lal Ch. Parikh 1938.

Likewise *prāsa* or *anuprāsa*⁶ has been treated by the early *ālaṅkārikās*.

Rime in the best of the probability developed from these two figures — *yamakam* and *prāsa*.

It imbibed the quality of an *anuprāsa* which in the parlance of the eleventh century *ālaṅkārika rasādyanugataḥ prakṛṣṭo nyāso'nuprāsaḥ*.⁷ Hemcandra too describes *anuprāsa* as *rasādyanugataḥ prakṛṣṭaḥ*⁸ in his *Śvopajñā-vṛtti*.

Rime on the other hand took the feature of the *yamakam*—*sadā-bhyāsaṁ tu yamakam* in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* of Bharata and the definition of *pādānta yamakam* is wide enough to embrace the scope of rime —

*caturṇaṁ yatra pādānamante syāt samamakṣaraṁ |
tadvai pādānta yamakam vijñeyam mamato yathā ||*⁹

akṣaramity ekamanekam ca saṁhṛtam.¹⁰

Daṇḍin too defines it: *saṁghāta gocarāṁ — yamakam*¹¹ — i.e., (vide *Bhāṣya*) *ekavarṇāvṛtti viśvavṛttiḥ anuprāsaḥ — anekavarṇāvṛttiḥ tu yamakam*.¹²

Vāmana is more clear in laying stress on this point — *pādānu-prāsaḥ pādayamakavat*¹³ *ye pādayamakasya bhedaḥ, te pādānuprāsasya ity arihaḥ*.

Practically, in the early parlance, *yamakam* can stand for all figures of sound. Yet it would not be an exaggeration to mention in this connection, that in Pāli literature *yamakam* has been applied in its true

-
6. a) The *Kāvyaḍarśa* — I. 55. “*varṇāvṛttiḥ anuprāsaḥ*”.....
 - b) The *Kāvyaālaṅkārasūtra vṛtti*—(Vāmana) IV.I. 8.—“*Śeṣaḥsarūpo' nuprāsaḥ*”.. Ed. Dr. Nagendra. 1954.
 - c) The *Kavyaprakāśa* — ullāsa IX. P. 201. “*varṇasāmānyam anuprāsaḥ*”—Ānandāśrama Series 89.
 - d) The *Kāvyaṇuśāsana* V. 1. “*Vyañjanasyāvṛtti ranuprāsaḥ*”.
 - e) “The *Anuprāsaḥ śabdsāmānyam vaiśamye'pi svarasyatat*”.
 - f) The *Śṅgāraprakāśa* II. P. 389. “*Varṇānāmanatidūrāntara māvṛttiḥ anuprāsaḥ*”.
 7. The *Kāvyaaprakāśa* — vṛtti on the definition of *anuprāsa*.
 8. The *Kāvyaṇuśāsana vṛtti* on the definition of *anuprāsa*. V.I.
 9. The *Nāṭyaśāstra* Ch. XVI. 63. Gos.
 10. Abhinavagupta's gloss on the definition.
 11. The *Kavyādarśa* I. 61.
 12. *Vṛtti* on the sūtra of I. 61. *Kavyādarśa*.
 13. *Vāmana* — IV. 1. 10.

form, where the term *yamiyam* has been inserted. The *Suttakiṭaṅga*¹⁴ one of the earliest Buddhist scriptures contains a number of verses where the example of the *saṃdaṣṭa yamakam* can be traced. Culminating all the ideas nurtured by the predecessors, Viśvanātha made the special treatment of rime in his *Sāhityadarpaṇa*.

*vyāñjanam ced yathāvasthaṃ sahādyena svareṇa tu
āvartyate'ntya yojyatvādantyānuprāsa eva tat*¹⁵ .]

*yathāvasthaṃ iti yathāsambhavam anusvāra visarga svarasam'yuktākṣara
viśiṣṭam eṣa ca prāyeṇa pādasya padasya cānte prayojyoh Padāntagaḥ
'mandam hasantaḥ pulkaṃ vahantaḥ'*

But *antyānuprāsa* in short, *prāsa* used in late century is not unheard of in prosody. Hemacandra, knew these two figures *prāsa* and *yamaka* but he despised *antyānuprāsa* in his *Kāvyānuśāsana*. But that he is fully aware of this figure has been fully detected in his treatment of the *Apa.* metre *khañjakam*,¹⁶ Where as *Pkt. Paṅgaḷam* used the common term *yamitam* for the use of both *prāsa* and *yamaka*.¹⁷ Gaṅga-dāsa too used common term for these two verbal figures.¹⁸ Complete absence of treatment of rhyme in the respective manuals in poetics led some authors to think that intrusion of rhyme in Sanskrit literature is due to the influence of foreign literature that came in close contact of it. The following dissertation is enough to foil the conception of those¹⁹

14. ZDMG. Vol. 40. PP. 101. 1886.

*Jamāyam paḍuppannam agamissam ca nāyao
savvam mannaṭi tam tai damśanāvaraṇ antae
antae vitigicche anelisam
anelisassa akkhāya*

15. The *Sāhitya Darpaṇa* X. 6. 6. KSS. 145.

16. "Galitakam eva yamakam sānuprāsam samaighri
khañjakam" - Chando' nuśāsanam IV. 42. vide vṛtti -
"Pūrvakāny eva galitakāni yamaka rahitāni, sānuprāsāni
yadi bhavanti tadā khañjaka samjñāni". He calls it
"anuprāsa" in contrast to *yamakam*.

17. In the definition of *Soraṭṭa chandaḥ*, *Pkt. Paṅgaḷam* I. 170. the word 'Yamaka' has been used. But in use, "Prasa" has been employed. Vide comm. p. 278. (B. I. Ed.)

"Yamakamanuprāsam vyācakṣya" where as the word "Yamaka" in the definition of 'Aḍileya' *chandaḥ* I. 128. shows the use of true *yamakam*.

18. The *Chandomañjari* VI. 15. CSS.

"Pratipāda yamakita ṣoḍaśamātrā etc.
Here the expression "yamakita" has reference to the rhymed *pāda*.

19. R.S. Dinakar - *Samskr̥ti Kā cār Adhyāya*, Delhi 1956. PP. 353-355.
Dr. H.P. Dvivedi - *Hindī Sāhitya Kā Ādikāl* - 1952, p. 93.

who specially argue that infiltration of rhyme in Sanskrit literature is due to the Arabic influence whose verse composition practice *Kāfiā*²⁰ a kind of *antyanuprāsa* from the early century of our era.

Almost every rhyming word has significance in that it is associated with one or another of the main thought feelings of the poem. Rhyme is rather unostentatious unlike *yamaka*, and always helping to shape and gives a clarity and edge to the content to the thought and feeling, coalesce with rhythm. That is why in the fervent lyrical passages of *Ṛsis* we would meet the rhymed verses. Rhyme in literature is associated with the metrical pause rather than with the sense pause. Necessity of terminal identical *pada* arises with reference to *pada*. In this connection, one should pay attention to another point i.e., the metrical pause, within the line where the rhyme has been practised, in order to make it more prominent. Late century literatures used to make practise of such artifice in the *stotra* type of *kāvya* which he will show later. In the earliest *stotrakāvya* it is not rare.

End rhyme in Ṛgvedic verses:

*Agnimīle purohitam
Yajñasya devamṛtvijam
Hotāraṃ ratnadhātamaṃ
Indrā yāhi dhiyeṣito
Viprajñataḥ sutāvataḥ
Upa Brahmāṇi vāghataḥ* RV. 1. 3. 5.

Rhyme in metrical pause:

*Yāni rūpāṇi utavṛṣṇyāni
Yā vāṇi pratnāni sakhyā śivāni
Tebhiḥ Somasya pibataṃ sutasya* Rv. I. 108. 5.
*Svāduṣkilāyaṃ madhumāṇi utāyaṃ
Tivrahkilāyaṃ rasavā utāyam* RV. VI. 47. 1.

The last one however, the example of application of chime, usually applied in the *apabhraṃśa* poetry. Usually remarkable the verse in which there exists both rime and chime:

*Nadam vā odatinām
Nadam yo yuvatinām* RV. VIII. 69.2 ab.

The rhyme is but correlating agent which binds consecutive lines and creates an organic pattern.

20. *Kāfiyā* - A term in prosody meaning rhyme generally which the Arabic poet always retains, till he has ended the poem.
Encyclopaedia of Islam, Vol. II. Pt. 2. P. 621.

"*Mutanabbi*" - An Arabic poetry claimed to be very earlier.

In the early *Piṭakas*, the rhyme applied sometimes enable to restore its verse form. The *Vinaya pitakam*. Vol. I pp, 42. –

*gambhīre nānāviṣaye,*²¹
anutare upādhisamkhaye.

The *Vinayapiṭakam*, Vol. II, p. 143 –

dighe. kacche, phone, latthe
sitha udakatelake
ādās udapaitavanā
ālepo madda cunnā.

The *Rāmāyaṇa* the first classical *kāvya* places the number of verses which are the furnishing proof of the fact that the conscious use of sound device. both rhyme and chime, was reorganised quite early in Sanskrit literature.

A few examples are sufficient to prove it :

tataḥ sa madhyaṅgatam aṁśumantaṁ
jyotsnā vitānaṁ muhur udvamantaṁ |
dadarśa dhīmān bhuvi bhānumantaṁ
goṣṭhe viśaṁ mattam iva bhramantaṁ ||

a fine specimen of rhyme and one should note even the occasional beat of it on the metrical pause.

Likewise

kṛtāni veśmāni ca pāṇḍurāṇi
tathā supuṣpāṇy api puṣkarīṇyaḥ
punaśca padmāni sakeśarāṇi
vanāni citrāṇi tathetarāṇi || (V. 7. 10 (Bombay ed.)

Bengali recension modifies the second line and reading runs thus :-

tathā praphullāni ca puṣkarāṇi |
punaḥ sa padmotpalakeśarāṇi vanāni citrāṇi tathetarāṇi ||

In V. 5. 16 (a) *ṇadadbhiḥ* (b) *susadbhiḥ* (c) *grasadbhiḥ* (d) *śvasadbhiḥ*.

In V. 7. 4. The lines end with *hitāni*, *mitāni*, *grhāṇi* and *anvitāni*.

So also in W. recension. V. 7. 16.

tataḥ sa tāṁ kapīr abhipatya pūjitaṁ
caran puriṁ daśamukha bāhunirjitāṁ |

21. Vide Rhys David's note in, SBE. XIII. PP. 149 – The words f down to "upādhisamkhaye" form a śloka. This is one of the cases, where an older passage was in verse.

*adrsya tām janakasutām suduḥkhitām
supūjitām patiguṇaveganirjitām //*

According to Bharata this can be taken as the illustration of *anīyayamaka*. But we should better take it as the best specimen of the *anīyānuprāsa*, because, according to later *alāṅkāra nibandhas* – *yamakaṃ tu vidhātavyam na kadācidapi tripāt* Over and above we can note the rhyme on the metrical pause, that we have already noticed even in the literature belonging to in the early fringe of the Vedic literature – *Jabhausajau gītī rucira caturgrahe*. This verse can be termed so therefore would have contain pause at fourth and at the end. Except the second line, we have fine rhyme at the fourth and at the end. To multiply the examples, we can show that the closing verse of the ch. V.7. contain rhyme, where the endings of the four lines are respectively – *tatmanah, vartmanah, tammanah* and *hṛtmanah*.

Practically speaking, in Vedic passages, in early Pāṇi literature, and even in epics, tricks of *yamaka* frequently can be noticed than the rimes indicating the *pāda* pause. Making foil to version of those who think that Arabic poetry inflicted rime to the body of Sanskrit *kāvya*s, we can show early Skt. *kāvya*s like those of Aśvaghoṣa and others present numerous passages with the rimed *pādas*. Following specimens are some of the numerous verses :-

The Buddhacaritam :- 1. 77.

*duḥkhārditebhyo viṣayāvṛtebhyāḥ
saṃsāra kāntārapathasthitebhyāḥ
ākhyāsyati hyeṣa vimokṣamārgaṃ
mārga pranaṣṭebhya ivādhvagebhyāḥ //*

II 4. *nānāṅkacihnaiḥ navahemabhāṇḍaiḥ
abhūṣitairlambasatāi stathānyaiḥ |
saṃcukṣubhe cāsyā purāṃ turaṅgaiḥ
balena maitrīyā ca dhanena cāptaiḥ //*

III. 1. *tataḥ kadācin mṛduśādvalāni
pumskokilonnādita pādapāni
śuśrāva padmākaramaṇḍitāni.
śīte nibaddhāni sa kānanāni //*

In The *Saundarananda kāvya* .

*calatkadambe himavannitambe |
tarau pralambe camaro lalambe //*

One should note the pause which falls on the fifth in the version of Arnold, the late ceasura.²²

22. Arnold *Vedic Metre*. Vide 206 iv and also 207 ii.

Rhymed verses are not rare in Buddhist Sanskrit literature. Series of verses of such a type can be traced in the *Lalitavistara* :-

P. 406. (Ed. R. L. Mitra).

*svagaṇṭake ṛtuvace āgatake
vayaṇjāta sujāta susaṁsthītikāḥ
ratīmo priyā phullitapādapake etc.*

Kālidāsa favours rime rather than *yamaka*.²³ But as an orthodox classical poet, he tried to avoid both of these verbal figures, so as Bhavabhūti.

The Śākuntala : Act. III 14.

*tumba ṇī āne hīaṇ mama uṇa maṇḍo divā arathīm |
ṇikkiva dāvai balīm tuha huamanorahāi angaīm ||*

Act. V. 1.

*ahinavamahuloha bhavio tahaparcimblocūo maṇjarīm |
kamalavasa imeo ṇivvuo mahuara visario sinam kaham ||*

The Mālatīmādhava : act. VI. 13.

*uddāmadehaparidāha mahājvarāṇi
saṅkalpa saṅgama vinodita vedanāni |
tvatsneha saṁvidavilambita jīvitāni
kīṇ vā mayāpi na dīnāny ativāhitāni ||*

It is in the *Śiśupālavadha*, we have some cases of *yamaka* which in late days is responsible for the growth of *yamakakāvya*. Among the Skt. kāvyas other than lyrics, *Haricarita* can be mentioned for its distinguishing traits, i.e., its adaptation of rhyme throughout the work. The occasional variation with double rhyme in the same foot, creates the lucidity coupled with smooth flow which appears like musical harmony. Without any doubt, the so called rhymed verses accord well with sweet and sonorous nature of *Gonḍi*, of long established standing.

Nowhere has been so successful the rhyme in musical adaptation of syllabic metre as in the *stotra kāvyas* in Sanskrit literature. The earliest type of which is *Gonḍ.stotragāthā* of Aśvaghoṣa, where religious message, musical execution and fervent lyrical appeal are joined in a fine symphony. But the later hymns are worth to cite because of their exquisite sense of rhythm in which the tranquility of thought is combined

23. Rhyme is the identity of sounds at the end of lines. This may be in the last syllable or in the last two syllables *chime* or *yamakam*, is the recurrence of the same words at any part of the lines. The words sometimes convey different senses sometimes not.

with the harmony in expression and symmetry in form. One should note the metrical pause at the seventh, fourteenth and twentyfirst of a *srag-dharā* verse which have been marked by the rhymed words :

Goṇḍistotra gāthā : VII, Lines 21–22

divyair ākarnapūraiḥ kamalāḍalanibhaiḥ pakṣmalilāvilolaiḥ |
bhāvasnigdhaiḥ vidagdhaiḥ pracalitalatikā sammitair bhṛūvilāsaiḥ ||

Lines 33–36 :

Mārāṇikair mahaughaiḥ asiparaśudhanuḥ śaktiśūlāgrahastaiḥ |
ulkāpātair anekairdahanapaṭuravaiḥ bhīṣaṇair bhīmanādaiḥ |
nakṣubdhaṃ yasya cittam giririva na calaṃ gāḍhaparyāṅka baddhaṃ
taṃ vande vandaniyaṃ tribhavabhayaharaṃ Buddhaviraṃ sūviraṃ ||

Likewise *birudas* and *gītas* of the Vaiṣṇavas are of greater interest for their extraordinary metrical harmony and prodigality of verbal dexterity.

The *Kṛṣṇāhnikakaumudī*²⁴ of Kavikarnapūra is in six *prakāśas* containing seven hundred and five rhymed syllabic metres. The *Mukunda-muktāvalī* proves to be a finest specimen of lyrical *kāvya*, in respect of its fine pictorial fancy and skillful adjustment of sound effect. Of the thirty rhymed stanzas, we can quote here one stanza in *mālinī* metre made memorable by effective middle rhyme.

Mālinī : *navajaladhara varṇaṃ – campakodbhāsi karṇaṃ*
vikasita nalināśyaṃ – visphuraṇa māndahāśyaṃ |
kanaka ruci dukūlaṃ – cāru barhāvacūlaṃ
kamapi nikhila sāraṃ – naumi gopī kumāraṃ ||

Similar attempt to evolve new rhythmic and lyrical forms through verbal and metrical melody being more effective by the jiggling of rhyme, in prose, verse and song has been vouchsafed by the hymnographer.

Syllabic metres like *citrā*, *jaloddhatagatī*, *tuṅaka*, *sragvīṇī*, even long *śārdūlavikridita* and *vasantatilaka* are employed with great skill and fine adjustment of sound effect. Without multiplying examples, we can place here one in rare *matta* in *svayamutprekṣita līlā* and in *jaloddhatagatī* in the *Mukundamuktāvalī*:

bhṛṅgiveyaṃ lāṃ aparimāyaṃ
mugdhā gandhaṃ hṛdikṛta bandhaṃ

vyagra prāṇā pulakita kāyā

premodbhātā drutam abhi yātā – ceasura falls on fourth
and sixth which is conventional.²⁵

Equally worth citing is much known *jalo ddhatagati*:-

vihāra sadanam manojña radanam

prāṇita madanam śāsāṅka vadanam

We need not swell our limited scope by devoting to further discussion in the amazing literary prodigality of the *stotrakāvyas* in wearing endless pattern of rhythmic richness in which the rhyme has an indispensable part to play. We may close our survey by referring memorable *gītis* of Jayadeva comprising both syllabic and moric metres which are distinguished by its embellished use of rhyme.²⁶

It can be said in view of what has been argued before that the evidence of the lyrical composition is decisive as the very old age of the rhyme. The evidence of *alaṅkāra* thought is no less undecisive. Bharata's definition of *yamaka*, embracing the scope of all kinds of figures of sound belongs to that position which are older than what we get in later works. Rhyme always aiming at musical grace through verse ending, appears sporadically in early so called lyric passages but visits frequently or regularly in later times discarding the fairly well established practice. Given dissertation is sufficient to show that even long and sustained composition in such a medium is also possible in Sanskrit *kāvyas*. It is elegant without being difficult and artificial and affluent without being devoid of conveying all shades of feelings.

25 a) Vide Halāyudha on the *sūtra* VI. 14. Piṅgaḷa ch. *sūtra* –
“*atra caturbhiḥ śadbhiḥca yatirityāmnāyah*”

b) *Jaloddhatagatir jasau jasau rasartayah* || VI 34.
Piṅgaḷa ch. *sūtra*; (*śadbhiḥ śadbhiḥca yatih*).

26 a) *vedānuddharat jagantivahate lūgolamudbibhrate*
daityam dārayate balim chalāyate kṣatrakṣayam kṛate
śardūlarikrīditu — pause at 12 (6-6)-7.

b) *mātrācchandaḥ*
patati patatre vicalita patre
śamkita bhavadupa yānam |
acayati śayanam sacakita nayanam
paśyati tava pāṇthānam || V || 11.

DR. BANI CHAKRAVORTHY

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE SOCIAL CUSTOMS
OF BENGAL AND MITHILĀ AS RECORDED IN THE
WORKS OF RAGHUNANDANA AND
VĀCASPATIMIŚRA*

It is intended here to discuss critically the views of Raghunandana of the sixteenth century, the fairest jewel in the crown of Bengal *smṛti*, recorded in his several works and those of Vācaspatimiśra¹ a *smṛti-nibandhakāra* of Mithilā of the fifteenth century in his several works.

Raghunandana has to his credit an encyclopaedic work on the different branches of *Dharmaśāstras* styled as *Śmṛtitattva*, divided into twenty eight sections called *tattvas*. Besides these, he also compiled more or less ten works, by which he earned for him the appellation '*Smṛtabhaṭṭācārya*' or simply '*Smārta*' from later writers. He is placed between A.D. 1510 to 1565.² On the other hand, Vācaspatimiśra is the foremost *smṛtinibandha*-writer of Mithilā. He composed several works of which the *Pitṛbhaktitaraṅgiṇī*, is the latest of his extant treatises. He declares at the end of this book³—

"*śāstre daśa smṛtau triṃśaḥ nibandhā yena yauvane |*
nirmīāstena carame vayasyeṣa vinirmame ||"

* Paper read in the twenty sixth session of the All India Oriental Conference, Ujjain, M.P., 1972.

1. This Vācaspatimiśra is to be distinguished from the great philosopher Vācaspati who was the author of the *Bhāmali*, on the *Śārirakabhāṣya* of Śaṅkara and of several other commentaries on other systems of Indian Philosophy, flourishing in the first half of the ninth century. There was another Vācaspati who wrote the *Smṛtisārasaṃgraha* and flourished in the first half of the eighteenth century. (History of Dharmaśāstra, Vol. 1, P.V. Kane, p. 405).
2. *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol. 1, by Kane, p. 419.
3. *Pitṛbhaktitaraṅgiṇī*, Ms. A.S.B. No. G 4127, folio - 92b.

Having composed in his youthful days ten works in the *śāstras* and thirty works in *smṛti*, he, now in his old age, made this treatise.

Vācaspatimiśra, the author of *smṛti* works flourished in the reigns of two kings, viz., Bhairavasimphadeva in his earlier years and of Bhairava's son Rāmabhadradeva of Mithilā in his later years.⁴ His literary activity must have therefore, spread over a large number of years, not less than thirty years from A.D. 1450 to 1480 when he became an old man.⁵

Raghunandana deserves to be congratulated not only for the composition of various treatises and for his vast scholarship in *Dharmaśāstra* literature, but also for his keen powers of observation with the intentions of protecting the *Brāhmaṇya dharma* and rituals in the helpless condition of the society of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries of Bengal. We may discuss here the political and social conditions of Bengal at that time. The people were much disturbed by both inner and outer outrages and invasions. Bengal Hinduism was much weakened by Buddhism, Jainism, Tāntrism and Islam. At the beginning of the composition of the vast *nibandha* literature the Buddhist Pāla kings, who reigned over Bengal, always tried to popularise the Buddhistic religion and many Buddhist works, were written under their encouragement, with the result that people began to be converted to Buddhism. After their regime, the Sena kings held the reigns of sovereignty in Bengal. Fortunately they were Brahmanists and so they encouraged the revival of Brahmanical ideas and practices. By their patronage many treatises were composed by Aniruddhabhaṭṭa, his royal patron, Ballālasena, his son, Lakṣmaṇasena and Halāyudha. But the effort of popularising Brahmanical rituals was soon stopped by the invasions of the Muhammedans. These Muhammedans diverted the minds of people from their religious works. By the tyranny of the invaders the backbone of the country totally broke down. In this helpless condition of the society Raghunandana appeared as an authority on the *śāstras*. Naturally, he had to undertake the difficult responsibility of saving the *Brāhmaṇya* rites and ceremonies from the torture of the Muhammedans. Before his appearance as an authority on the *śāstras*, other Bengali *nibandhakāras* like Śūlapāṇi, Bṛhaspati, Rāyamukuta, Śrīnātha, Ācārya Cūḍāmaṇi, Govindānanda etc, partly tried to protect the society and *Brāhmaṇya dharma* by composing several *nibandhas*, but their attempts were not crowned with complete success. Then the difficult task of writing such works as would remove the doubts and divergent opinions as regards the performance of the Brahmanical rites, was bestowed upon Raghu-

4. History of Mithilā, U.N. Thakur, p. 333.

5. History of Navya-Nyāya, Dinesh Chandra Bhattacharya, p. 157.

nandana. So he had to criticize and refute the opinions of many nibandha-writers of different regions of India and establish his own views so distinctly as would prevent confusion among the people. Raghunandana thus criticized the views of the nibandha-writers of Mithilā to determine the exact rites and customs which are purely Brahmanical. So he vociferously rejected the views of Vācaspatimiśra; the crest jewel among the scholars of Mithilā with such terms as *Vācaspatimiśroktam heyam*, *Maithiloktam heyam*, *Miśroktam apāṣṭam* (i.e., the views of Vācaspatimiśra is to be rejected, the opinion of the Maithilas is to be refuted, the view of Miśra is refuted, etc.). The present writer in her Bengali monograph entitled *Samājasaṃskāra Raghunandana* has discussed the views of Raghunandana as compared with those of other *nibandhakāras* of Bengal and those of Mithilā.

On the other hand, Vācaspatimiśra of Mithilā made no attempt to reject so boldly the views of the writers of Bengal, though the social conditions of Mithilā had become equally painful in those days. Since the break-up of the Videhan monarchy and Vajjian confederacy, extending down to the advent of the kaṣṇāṭas in the eleventh century A.D., the history of Mithilā became a story of continuous defeats and subjugations. Being politically stagnant Mithilā lay prostrate at the feet of the conquerors. It was after a long spell that she rose under the brave and inspiring leadership of great Nānyadeva, the founder of the Kaṣṇāṭa or the Simraon dynasty in which a new era of splendid glory and great achievements of Hindu monarchy was re-established.⁶ But after having ruled over Mithilā for two centuries and a quarter, this dynasty also met its tragic end. Then the Sugaon dynasty of Kāmeśvara was established by the Emperor Ghias-ud-din Tughluq and the rulers of this family played no remarkable existence. During the reign of Simraon regime and Sugaon dynasty Mithilā tried her utmost to continue the Hindu scholarship and learning through *Nyāya*, *Mīmāṃsā* and *Dharmaśāstra studies*. But during the later regime the country was much disturbed by Mussalman inroads and Buddhism, Jainism and Tāntrism also knocked at the doors of the region before long. We know the versatile scholars in Mithilā like Caṇḍeśvaraṭhakkura, Vidyāpati upādhyāya, Vācaspatimiśra, etc., who composed their treatises at this condition of the society of Mithilā under the kings of these regimes.

Now we may discuss critically various social customs, as recorded in the works of Raghunandana and those of Vācaspatimiśra.

In the month of *Jyeṣṭha* there is a *vrata* called *Daśaharā* occur at the conjunction of the tenth *tithi* of *Jyeṣṭha* with the bright fortnight

6. History of Mithilā, p. 227.

and the *Hastā* asterism. In this *vrata* a person would have to bathe in the Ganges and become free from ten sins, namely *mahāpātakas* (i.e., mortal sins), *upapātakas* (i.e., minor sins) etc.

The ten sins are divided into three classes namely of the body, of speech and of mind. It was supposed that the Goddess *Gāṅgā* came down to the earth on this *tithi*. Raghunandana opines that in *Daśaharā vrata* the Ganges only has been prescribed fit for bathing, but not any other river, as the name of the Ganges occurs in the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*.⁷ But according to Vācaspatimiśra, a man has got to bathe in any river on the *Daśaharā* day by which he would obtain the spiritual result of this *vrata*.⁸ Caṇḍeśvaraṭhakkura of Mithilā has commented that the bath in the Ganges in this *vrata*, destroys the ten sins and a man acquires the requisite religious merit, but the bath in any other river also destroys the ten sins only.⁹ Now a days in the society of Bengal, the bath in the Ganges is resorted to, according to Raghunandana's prescription a festival and worship of the Ganges are celebrated generally on that day.

In the *Janmāṣṭamī vrata* if there is *Rohiṇīnakṣatra* (asterism) on the midnight of the eighth *tithi* of the dark half of *Bhādra*, the *tithi* is then styled as the *Jyāñīti*; if a man observes a fast on that *tithi*, that destroys his sins committed by him in his childhood, youth and old age and even in many previous lives also. The main items of this *vrata*, are the fast and worship of Lord Kṛṣṇa etc. But if there is no Rohiṇī star on *Bhādra* dark half of the eighth *tithi*, it is called simply *Janmāṣṭamī*, according to Raghunandana.¹⁰ But Vācaspatimiśra states in his *Dvaita-nirṇaya*¹¹ that the *Jyāntīvrata* is to be performed if there is *Rohiṇī* in

7. *vastutastu vakṣyamāṇabhaviṣye Jāhnavīpada-śravaṇāt hetuvannigada svarasācca Brahmavaivarte' pi saritpadam Jāhnavīparamanyathā nānāvidhiḥ syāt -*

*Jyāiṣṭhaśukladaśamyāmtu hastāyogena Jāhnavī |
harate daśa pāpāni tasmāddaśaharocyate ||*

Tithitattva p. 24.

8. *evam Jyāiṣṭhaśukladaśamyām kevalāyām nadīsnānasya daśavidha pāpābhi-
śuddhiḥ phalam, evam dānasya'*

Kṛtyamahārṇava, Ms. No. A.S.B. 3420 f. 31b.

9. *maṇḍalavāra'astāyukta-jyāiṣṭhaśukladaśamyāmvam-vidhiḥ punyasañcayo daśa-
vidhapāpa-kṣayaśca phalam Gāṅgāyām sarinmāire tu daśavidhapāpanāśanam*

Kṛtyaratnākara, p. 188.

10. *'yathā-simhārka' rohiṇīyukta narāḥ Kṛṣṇāṣṭamī yadi rātryardhapūrvāparagā
jayanti kalayāpica iti Varāhasamhitā'.*

Tithitattva, p. 16.

11. *'Dvādaśasvapi Kṛṣṇāṣṭamīḥ rohiṇīyogapuraskāreṇa Jayantīvrataṃ'.*

Dvaitanirṇaya, p. 60:

the eighth *tithi* of the darkhalf of the twelve months. In his *Kṛtyamahārṇava* and *Varṣakṛtya*, Vācaspatimiśra's view tallies with the same opinion.¹² By criticizing this view Raghunandana is of opinion that the *Rohiṇi* asterism does never occur in the eighth *tithi* of the darkhalf of the twelve months.¹³ So in the society of Bengal the *Janmāṣṭami vrata* would be observed in the month of *Bhādra* alone and if there occurs a conjunction in the eighth *tithi* in the darkhalf, the *Jayantivrata* would be celebrated when the fast would be performed mainly by the householders.

A few words may now be said about some types of *śrāddha* in which the social practices of Bengal differ from those of Mithilā.

The *vrddhiśrāddha* is to be performed on auspicious occasions or on the undertaking of meritorious acts as the word *vrddhi* literally means 'luck' or 'auspicious event'. The auspicious occasions are births or marriages of sons and daughters, or entering into a new house, or naming a child, at the time of *cūḍākaraṇa* (a rite in which a lock of hair is kept after the first cutting of the same on child's head), at *simantonnayana* ceremony observed by women in the fourth, sixth or eighth month of pregnancy) etc. It is remarkable here that the Hindus in Bengal have faith in different *saṃskāras* which would be performed to remove the taints derived from the parents and the accumulated taints due to seed, blood and womb, are removed by these various *saṃskāras*. Now a days the *saṃskāras* also are celebrated collectively or separately. According to Raghunandana, on the occasion of *niṣkramaṇa* (i.e., taking the child out of the house in the open), *annaprāśana* (i.e., making the child eat cooked food for the first time), *cūḍākaraṇa*, *upanayana* (taking near the *ācārya* for instruction), etc. the *vrddhiśrāddha* would have to be performed but *garbhādhāna* *saṃskāra* (a ceremony performed before the first conception) no such

12. 'atira ca vrata rohiṇīyoga yukto' pyupalakṣaṇam.

varṣe varṣe ityabhidhāne sarvavarṣakartavyopasamhārāt. atraitadaṣṭamyā rātrir jayanti':

Kṛtyamahārṇava Ms. f. 45a,
and *varṣakṛtya* Ms. A.S.B. No. G. 8682 f. 24a.

After this statement, Vācaspatimiśra quotes the views of the Bengal *smṛti* regarding the observance of the fast and worship of Lord Kṛṣṇa when the midnight, the *Rohiṇi* asterism and the eighth *tithi* in the dark fortnight are in conjunction.

Kṛtyamahārṇava Ms. f. 45b.

3. 'Dvaitanirṇayoktaṃ nirastaṃ uktavacanavirodhāt dvādaśasu māseṣvaṣṭamyāṃ rohiṇīyogasya sarvathaiva sambhavācca'.

Tīhītattva, p. 16.

vṛddhiśrāddha need be performed.¹⁴ On the other hand, Vācaspatimiśra expresses his view that in *niṣkramaṇa* and *annaprāśana saṃskāras* also, there is no necessity of *vṛddhiśrāddha*¹⁵ but in *garbhādhāna saṃskāra*, this *śrāddha* is to be celebrated.¹⁶

It is also believed by the Hindus that there are sixteen *śrāddhas* which must be performed for a deceased person and that if these are not performed, then the departed spirit is not freed from the condition of being a *preta* and a *piśāca*, i.e., the state of cursed departed souls.

If there happens any disturbance in the performance of the sixteen *śrāddhas* or if the exact *tithi* of the death of the deceased person is not known, then that *śrāddha* would have to be performed specially on an eleventh *tithi* of the dark fortnight or on newmoon day. Vācaspatimiśra is of opinion that due to the nonperformance in the eleventh *tithi* of the dark fortnight, a man may perform the *śrāddhas* on the same *tithi* of the bright fortnight.¹⁷ But Raghunandana criticizes this view of the Maithīlas and decides that in that eventuality the *śrāddha* would have to be done in the eleventh *tithi* of the dark half of the moon only and not of the bright half, and the *śāstric* prescription in this matter does not warrant its performance on the newmoon also.¹⁸

On the other hand, if the *tithi* of the deceased, has been forgotten, that *tithi* is to be taken for performing the *śrāddha* of a just deceased person when the news of his death reaches his relatives.

14. 'tena cūḍākaraṇāt prāḡ niṣkramaṇānnaprāśanayor abhyudayikaṃ na kūryaṃ... itī Vācaspatimiśroktam nīrastam.

Malamāsattattva, p. 300.

15. 'tatra nāmakarmanīty abhidhāya cūḍākarmādikeṣviti vacanāt nāmakaraṇacūḍākaraṇamadhya-pātinor niṣkramaṇānnaprāśanayor vṛddhi śrāddham nāsiītī pratīyate. anyathā nāma-karmādika itī vadei'.

Kṛtyacintāmaṇi, p. 16.

16. 'kecittu garbhādhānāmapi gaṇe' ntarniveśya tatrāpi śrāddhapratīśedham varṇayanti tanna, niṣekakāle some cety ādinā garbhādhānopakramaśrāddhavi-dhānāt.'

Malamāsattattva, p. 300.

17. 'śrāddhaviḡhne samutpanne kṣayāhe vidite tathā | ekādaśyām prakurvīta kṛṣṇapakṣe viśeṣataḥ || viśeṣataḥ itī vacanādasambhave śuklaikadaśyāmapī karaṇam.'

Śrāddhacintāmaṇi, p. 139.

18. 'Maithīloktam śuklaikadaśyām tatkaranaṃ na yuktaṃ ... asmanmate tu kṛṣṇapakṣe ekadaśyāmamāvasyāpekṣayā viśeṣataḥ prakurvīte-tyekam vākyam'.

Tithitattva, p.7.

When also the *tithi* in which the death is heard, has been lost in oblivion, then the eleventh *tithi* of the dark half of the moon or the new-moon day of that month, would be taken fit for *śrāddha*. No *śrāddha* for the deceased is to be observed if the month of the receipt of that news of the death has been forgotten.¹⁹ This view of Vācaspatimiśra does not hold good according to Raghunandana, who states that on that occasion *śrāddha* would surely be performed in the eleventh *tithi* of dark fortnight, in case of not being able to do so, the newmoon day *tithi* would be taken as the next appropriate one for the performance of *śrāddha* in question.²⁰

From this forgoing discussion we find that Raghunandana has criticized boldly the views of Vācaspatimiśra regarding various social customs. At the time of the flourishing of Raghunandana the people of Bengal had been much disturbed both by inner and outer outrages and invasions and so they had become puzzled to determine what is right and hence fit to be followed by them. So the society of Bengal was in need of such a strong lawgiver in *Dharmaśāstra* who might point out clearly the rites and ceremonies, mentioned by the *śāstras*, following which people may carry on their day to day *dharma*. Raghunandana was such a meritorious student of and competent writer on *Dharmaśāstra* in some of its important aspects, bearing on the contemporary social condition that he accepted the views of other writers in some cases and did not also hesitate to reject them if necessary in some other cases. By refuting the opinions of Vācaspatimiśra, Raghunandana with his vast scholarship and learning, excelled the former by his superior insight and became well-known in Bengal as a great social and religious reformer.

19. 'tithirapi vismarāṇe tanmāśasyaikādaśyām amāvasyāyām vā ekoddiṣṭaḥ śravaṇa-māśasyāpi vismarāṇe na kāryam mānābhāvāt',

Śrāddhacintāmaṇi, p. 140.

20. *Vācaspatimiśroktam heyam, śravaṇādivismarāṇe tanmāśīaikādaśyamāvāsyaḥ grahaṇam yaduktam tadapi pramāṇaśūnyam.*

Tithitattvam, p. 7-8.

Dr. P. SRIRAMAMURTI

INFLUENCE OF TELUGU ON SANSKRIT

Sanskrit literature is pan-Indian in character with distinct contributions from each region. The stamp of regional literatures and culture is clearly seen in the works of Sanskrit literature produced in different parts of the country. Sanskrit was for a long time written in local scripts like the Telugu or the Grantha or the Śārada before the advent of the script Devanāgarī. The pronunciation of Sanskrit sounds is marked by the characteristics of the local speech habits. The Telugus pronounce 'tha' as 'dha'; vocalic 'r' as 'aru' or 'ru', and 'l' is pronounced as 'ṛ' *kalāḥ as kaḷāḥ* as is the habit in Telugu and also represented phonetically.¹

Telugu verse forms and literary forms influenced Sanskrit compositions. The *kandapadya* in the *Ārumbāka* plates of *Bādapa* and other verses like *utpalamāla* and *campakamāla* are seen in Sanskrit compositions. The peculiar forms of *gadya-kalikā*, *utkalikā* and the literary forms of the nature of panegyrics are also peculiar to the Sanskrit literature of this region. The works of Pāṅkuriki Somanātha are the earliest examples of this type. *Prāsayati* is a characteristic feature of Telugu prosody and this has also crept into Sanskrit compositions of the region.

The intellectual feats called *avadhānas* are a peculiar Telugu tradition still alive in this part of the country. Mallinātha is described

-
1. In the Sanskrit inscriptions of Āndhra where Telugu proper nouns are adopted into Sanskrit compositions short 'e' and 'o' appear. Words like *Peddibhaṭṭa*, *Dendulūr*, *Koṭṭiśarman*, *Konaśīma* are familiar.

A name like 'Ōrugallu' is either written as *orugalluḥ* or translated as *ekaśiḷā nāgara*. Proper nouns like *Simha bhūpāla* are written in various forms as *Śiṅga bhūpāla*, *Siṅga bhūpāla* etc., according to local pronunciation.

as a śatāvadhānin. Aṣṭāvadhānins and śatāvadhānins are found even today. These feats are performed in Sanskrit in the beginning and later both in Sanskrit and Telugu. Similarly harikathā is a kind of popular method of edification and Sanskrit harikathās are also written by great exponents like Ādibhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa dāsa of Vijayanagaram.

The *Pra āparudrīya* of Vidyānātha started a new genre of *alaṅkāra* works which may be designated as the Yaśobhūṣaṇa type. In these works a patron-king or deity is uniformly praised in the illustrative verses composed by the lakṣaṇakāra himself. Vidyānātha wrote a drama called *Pratāparudrakalyāṇa* to illustrate the rules of dramaturgy. In the *Alaṅkārasudhānidhi* of Sāyaṇa, we find that the hero forming the subject-matter of the illustrative verses is the author himself. Naturally in these works the exploits of Āndhra Kings and their benevolent rule are described in detail. In the *Pra āparudrīya*, we find the definitions of a new class of works called *ksudraprabandhas* since such compositions are composed in this part of the country. Among several other works which describe these compositions, we may mention the *Camatkāracandrikā*, *Alaṅkārasaṅgraha* and the *Lakṣaṇadīpikā*. The *Lakṣaṇadīpikā* of Gaurana contains citations from Telugu literature also.

In the *Camatkāracandrikā*, we find the use of *deśyapadas* : *calamartigaṇḍanṛpatiḥ* – title of Sarvajñasiṅgabhūpāla.

The *maṇipravāḷa* style also is prevalent. eg.,

kiṃ dāruṇā vaṅkaraṭiṅkareṇa
kiṃ vāsasā cīkiribākireṇa
śrī Siṅgabhūpāla vilokanāya,
vaṭṭuṣya mekaṃ viduṣāṃ saḥāyaḥ."

Similarly one is advised to drop such words being homophonous with Telugu words may suggest a bad meaning to the Telugu readers. In Bhāṣā-ślēṣa examples are given which mean one thing in Sanskrit and another in Telugu :

'melāyanāya te rājyaṃ' – mā ca ilā ca mele, tayoh mārgaḥ
melāyanam, tasmai

melāyanāya = lakṣmī bhūmi nivāsasthānāya.

melāyanāyeryādiṣu padeṣu bhadra mabhavadvā ityādyarthavācīṣu
taddēśabhāṣā viduṣām Āndhrabhāṣā ca prattiyate—C.C.P. 103.

The Bhāṣas produced in Āndhradeśa generally describe the festivities connected with the different deities of this region or the city life of some places. The *Śṛṅgārabhūṣaṇabhāṇa* of Vāmanabhaṭṭabāṇa describes the spring festival of Virūpākṣadeva in the early Vijayanagar times. *Madanavilāsabhāṇa* of Nāganātha describes the spring festival

of Kālyāṇanārāyaṇa worshipped at Rācakonḍa. The *Śṛṅgāraśa-bhṛṅgārabhāṇa* of Koṇḍa describes the festival of Mallikāṛjuna of Śrī-śaila while Durvādi Viśvanātha's *Śṛṅgāramañjarībhāṇa* deals with the caitra festival of Vallabharāya of Śrīkākuḷam. Thus incidentally they throw light on various local fairs and affairs. The *Premābhīrāma*, a work of the Vīthī type is said to depict the rambling of gentlemen Mañcana and Tīṭṭibha in the streets of Warangal describing the religious and social life of the place.

We may also mention here how the history and geography of the region has found a place in Sanskrit literature. The different historical kāvyas especially works like the *Madhurāvijaya*, *Raghunāthābhīyudaya*, and *Vemabhūpālacarita* have given a poetic account of the royal families and the exploits of those kings. In the *Vemabhūpālacarita*, we have a detailed description of Drākṣārāma, Addaṅki and other places. The *Haṁsasandēśa* of Vāmanabhaṭṭabāṇa describes Āndhra rivers Kṛṣṇa, Godāvāri and refers to local legends also. In the *Madhurāvijaya* there is also a reference to Tikkanaśomayājīn who is one of the great translators of the *Mahābhārata* into Telugu.

Telugu grammars are written in Sanskrit. The Āndhra śabda-cintāmaṇi is ascribed to Nannaya, the first great poet of Telugu, is in āryā verses. The technical terms of Sanskrit and Prākṛit Grammar are adopted to describe Telugu language. The *Atharvaṇakārikāvali* or *Vikṛtīviveka* contains *kārikās* ascribed to an Atharvaṇa and they are found cited in the commentary of Ahobalapāṇḍita on the *Cintāmaṇi*. Among others we may mention *Sūtrāndhravyākaraṇa* of Cinnayasūri, *Harikārikās* of Śiṣṭu Kṛṣṇamūrti śāstrin.

Translations of Telugu classics into Sanskrit is another important feature. The *Vasucaritra prabandha* of Rāmarājabhūṣaṇa is translated into Sanskrit by Kālahastikavi in about A.D 1600. Similarly the *Kaḷā-pūrṇodaya* is translated into beautiful Sanskrit prose recently by yarasūri Mallikāṛjuna Rao. The *Śatakas* of Vemana, Dāśarathī, Sumatī, Bhāskara etc., are translated into simple Sanskrit verses. There are several others who have written plays and verses based on Pravarākhyā-Varūthini episode of the *Manucaritramu* of Allasāni Peddana and the *Rukminīkalyāṇa* and Prahlāda stories of the *Bhāgavatamu* of Pōtana so famous in Telugu literature.

Certain Telugu customs and proverbs are found mentioned in the Sanskrit works. The play *Indirāpariṇaya* by Vīrarāghava refers to the songs of āratī sung by the ladies of Āndhra at the time of marriage of Lakṣmī and Nārāyaṇa.

In this way the Sanskrit literature produced in different regions of the country reflects the special characteristics thereof like the speech habits, cultural and literary styles.

Dr. N. SUBBU REDDIAR

THE TWO SECTS IN SOUTH INDIAN VAIṢṆAVISM*

The two sects in the South Indian Vaiṣṇavism are known as Vāṭakalai, the northern school and Teṅkalai, the southern school. The former owes its allegiance to Vedānta Deśikaṇ and the latter to Maṇavālamāmuṇikaḷ. These names, Vāṭakalai and Teṅkalai, are of very late origin and perhaps belong to a period subsequent to Maṇavālamāmuṇikaḷ. The differences which could have been instrumental in the naming of the two schools have been deep-rooted from early times, perhaps in the period which followed the passing away of Rāmānuja. An attempt is made in this paper to consider the probable causes which precipitated such a division in Rāmānuja's school of Vaiṣṇavism, and also a study of those differences is briefly attempted.

Śrībhāṣyam and *Bhagavadgītā* do not suggest any clue that could have given rise to any difference in the interpretation of the central doctrines which they deal with nor does the *Nālāyira Divya Prabandham* contain any. It is a matter of common knowledge among the South Indian Vaiṣṇavites at least, that Rāmānuja was taught some secret doctrines by Tirukkōṭṭiyūr Nambi.¹ These were known as Rahasyas and must have included the three, namely, Tirumantram, Dvayam and Carama-ślokaṁ, the last being taken from the Gītā.² Unlike as in the case of *Brahmasūtras*, *Bhagavadgītā* and *Tiruvāymoḷi* (the important work of Nammālvār), there was no authentic work treating these *rahasyas*. These having been orally transmitted, there must have been ample scope for a preceptor to give an exposition of them in a manner which he felt was not merely the correct one but also authentic. There must

* Paper read at the XXVI Session of 'All India Oriental Conference' held at Ujjain in October, 1972.

1. *Yatirājavaibhavam*, 58.

2. Bh. G. 18: 66.

have been slight variations in the expositions offered by more than one preceptor for the same *rahasyas*. The methods which were adopted by the preceptors in the practice of their conduct must have been different according to individual capacities and these must have a bearing in the interpretations of the *rahasyas*. The disciple also should have taken only such interpretations as authentic and supported them by citing those practices. In fact, there were some practices in the days of Rāmānuja which called forth criticism from certain quarters.³ These were individual cases and also represented exceptions to the general customs. The masters and pupils in the same and succeeding generations cited such practices and chose to treat them as the correct ones, forgetting their departures from the established rules. This, however, was not always the case. The attitude of others was different towards such practices resulting in the evolution of not two theories, one for and the other against them, but more than two, their number depending on the number of approaches made by them. This resulted in another change of attitude towards tradition. Every interpretation was required to be substantiated by relevant citations from works of accepted authenticity. In their attempt to justify their interpretations, the preceptors and scholars forced their views on the sources and expounded them in a manner that could accommodate their view points. Thus started the differences in the interpretation of the passage in the *Tiruvāymoḷi* by Tirumālaiyāṇṭān and Rāmānuja⁴. Even after the commentary was written by Pillāṇ on the *Tiruvāymoḷi*, Parāśara bhaṭṭar is mentioned, as evidenced in the *Itu*, to have expressed disagreement to the views of Pillāṇ and offered his own.⁵ The tone of references to such differences both in the period of Rāmānuja and Parāśara bhaṭṭar is only suggestive of these two savants' eagerness to offer a better interpretation and not intended to cross the earlier ones. Much discredit was brought by later scholars for the earliest exponents by reading in between the lines and by asserting the authenticity of their own expositions. The unitary nature of the concepts of *rahasyas* was thus lost sight of. This resulted in the formulation of certain concepts most of them being based on the side of religion. Such concepts were acceptable to only one of the traditional schools and drew justifications from the *Nāḷayiram* and the passages from the works of earlier writers. There was not much for the two schools of Vaiṣṇavism to quarrel about regarding the matters in the *Śrībhāṣyam* and the *Bhagavadgītābhāṣyam* which were not therefore cited. The *rahasyas* and the compositions of the Āḷvārs afforded ample scope for the exhibition of the divergences of opinion. While one school interpreted the *rahasyas* and the *Tiruvāymoḷi* without even suggesting a deviated sense for them by remaining faithful to the sacred sources

3. *Guruparamparā*, pp. 121, 122, 149.

4. Vide *Itu on Tiruvāymoḷi* (T.V.M.) 1.2: 1, 2.3: 3; 5.10: 4.

5. Vide *Itu on T.V.M.* 6.5; 2.4: 1.

like *Dharmaśāstras* and *Āgamas*, the other school swore by the deviation and supported it by the practice of the teacher who was held in the highest respect. It was not the language that effected this schism. While equal importance was given in one school for the Sanskrit and Tamil sources, the other school stood more by the Tamil sources ignoring the Sanskrit sources when they ran counter to the former and thus attached less significance to Sanskrit sources. For a long period till recently, the followers of the Tenkalai system were deeply studied in the Sanskrit sources like *Śrībhāṣyam* and *Gītā-bhāṣyam* for matters of philosophical importance and followed the views of their school in matters pertaining to the *rahasyas* and *Prabandham*. The Two sources were thus kept apart thus maintaining in practice the concept of Ubhayavedānta. The ācārya was the only guide in these matters for the Tenkalai school, while he was also the guide for the Vaṭakalai school.

The differences which keep these two schools apart from each other seem to have taken their rise in the latter half of the thirteenth century and are mentioned by Nainārāccaṇ Piḷḷai, Piḷḷai Lokācāryar and Vedānta Deśikaṇ in their works. This does not, however, suggest that the two schools were treated then as rivals as they are held today. Vedānta Deśikaṇ, who was aware of such differences, remarks that there was no difference regarding the doctrines among the followers of Rāmānuja and there existed only a difference in the interpretation of the same doctrine.⁶ The differences must have become marked resulting in the rise of the two distinct schools in the fifteenth century A.D. The Vaṭakalai school traces the origin of their doctrines to Kiṭāmpi Āccāṇ who was in charge of serving food for Rāmānuja.⁷ The Tenkalai school does it to Empār, the cousin and disciple of Rāmānuja. It is curious to note that neither of these scholars, however, left any written record of their theories.

The main points on which these two sects differed are said to be eighteen.⁸ It is worthwhile to consider briefly what these differences are:

1. *God's grace*: The Tenkalai school insists that the operation of God's grace is unconditioned by human endeavour and is absolute. They say that the well-known text "He is to be obtained only by the one whom He chooses"⁹, is confirmed by the carama-śloka of Gītā¹⁰ and

6. *Satsampradāyapariśuddhi*, p. 5.

7. cf. *Rahasyatrayasāram*, p. 1377.

8. An anonymous Sanskrit verse quoted by Sri V. Krishnamacharya in his beautiful Sanskrit introduction (p.48) to *Saṅkalpa-Sūryodayam* gives out these eighteen differences.

9. Kaṭh. Up. 2: 23

10. Bh. G. 18: 66.

the mystic experience of Nammālvār. According to Vāṭakalais, God's grace though it is uncaused becomes operative only through bhakti or prapatti, just as the divine tree is considered to yield the results desired by the seekers of them only at their request. Those who are in need of God's grace have to make a request of God for it.¹¹ They argue that if grace is free and unconditioned, vaiṣamya or arbitrariness and nairghṛṇya or cruelty would be attributable to the divine nature.¹² In that case, all people would in time be emancipated, and there would be no need of any effort on their part. If it was supposed that God in his own spontaneity extended His grace to some in preference to others, He would have to be regarded as partial. It is therefore to be admitted that, though God is free in extending His mercy, yet in practice He extends it only as a reward to the virtuous or meritorious actions of the devotee. God, though all-merciful and free to extend His mercy to all without effort on their part, does not actually do so except on the occasion of the meritorious actions of His devotees. The extension of God's mercy is thus both without cause (nirhetuka) and with cause (sahetuka).

2. *Mokṣa* There is no difference of opinion as to mokṣa being the ultimate goal. The Teṅkalais believe that for those who take the course of devotion, mokṣa consists in having the experience of God Himself, but those who take to the path of self surrender have to render service to God even during the state of release. But the Vāṭakalais believe that whatever be the course adopted by the individuals, they become released without any distinction among themselves. They have therefore occasions for experience of God as well as service.

3. *Means of mokṣa*. According to the Teṅkalais, there are five kinds of means namely, karma-yoga, jñāna-yoga, bhakti-yoga, prapatti-yoga and ācāryābhimāna-yoga for mokṣa. They believe that prapatti-yoga is a distinctive means from the rest and also believe that each of these five means is a means by itself. But the Vāṭakalais believe that bhakti-yoga is the only other means of mokṣa besides prapatti-yoga. karma-yoga and jñāna-yoga are only stages leading to bhakti-yoga. karma-yoga is actually self-purification which destroys egoism and leads to jñāna-yoga which is the process of self-realization by self-renunciation, contemplation and the attainment of the orison of *Kaivalya*. The third stage is the bhakti-yoga which is the unitive life of beholding God face to face or spirit to spirit. This is the highest realization of reality. Respect for the teacher, according to this school, is only a phase of prapatti-yoga.

11. *Lakṣmī Tantra* (L.T.) 17: 78

12. *Vedāntasūtra* (V.S.) 2.1: 34.

4. *Lakṣmī (Her status)*: Lakṣmī occupies an important position in Śrī Vaiṣṇavism. But as there are only three categories in the Śrī Vaiṣṇavite system, a question may naturally arise regarding the position of Lakṣmī in the three-fold categories of Cit, Acit and Īśvara. On this point, the Teṅkalais hold that Lakṣmī is by nature atomic in size and occupies a special and unique place of her own below that of Bhagavān; they relegate Her to the level of jīva, the finite being, but consider her entitled to the service of the selves in this world and to that of the nityas and the muktas in the world beyond, viz., the region of eternal glory (nityavibhūti). Bhagavān, according to them, is however, the sole *upāya* for the attainment of *mokṣa* and Lakṣmī has no part in this in the same way as she has no part in the creation, sustenance, and destruction of the world. The Vaṭakalais believe that Lakṣmī is *akāra* and not *makāra* or jīva and state that she is an inseparable attribute of Bhagavān as described in *Pāñcarātra*,¹³ equally infinite and illimitable, without whom the conception of the Lord is impossible.¹⁴ She is not *anu* or atomic, but *vibhu* or all-pervasive and omnipresent. They base their argument on the authority of *Viṣṇu-purāṇa*,¹⁵ Lakṣmī, according to them, is in every way the object of equal veneration and worship as Bhagavān and that our worship is always to the Lord and His spouse. Being inseparable from Him, She participates in all His activities except in the creation, maintenance and dissolution of the world. She is *śeṣi* to all of us, bhaddas, muktas and nityas as much as Lord Himself. This concept of Vaṭakalai school receives support from the following evidences: (a) The Lord declares that *līlā vibhūti* and *nitya vibhūti* are the *śeṣa* for Him and Lakṣmī.¹⁶ This means that She is also the *śeṣi* like the Lord; (b) Parāśara declared that Viṣṇu represents all coming under the category of male and Lakṣmī those under the female.¹⁷ (c) Kīṭāmpi Āccāṇ told Nañciyar that he was taught by Rāmānuja that the mention of the Lord in any context must be taken to have included Lakṣmī.¹⁸ This is attested by Parāśara bhaṭṭar;¹⁹ (d) Śrī Rāmamiśra, the pupil of Rāmānuja declared that Lakṣmī and Viṣṇu together are Brahman²⁰; (e) Piḷḷai Lokācāryar states in his work *Tattvātraya*²¹ that the eternal kind of the selves refer to Ādiśeṣa, Garuḍa and others. If, in his view, Lakṣmī was a self, She, being eternal, must have been mentioned here.

13. L.T. 4: 1; 2: 15.

14. *Rāmāyaṇa* (Rām.) 6.21: 15.

15. V.P. 1 8: 17 and 1.9: 124

16. *Viṣvakṣenasamhitā*.

17. V.P. 1.8: 35.

18. R.T.S. p 750

19. *Śrī Guṇaratnakośa*, 28.

20. This is taken from the author's work *Ṣaḍarīhasamkṣepa*.

21. *Tattvātraya* p. 45.

5. *Lakṣmī (Her power)*: According to Tenkalai school, Viṣṇu alone can grant final emancipation. But Lakṣmī can play the role of a mediator between the sinning folk and the Lord; She cannot exercise independent or coordinate power in granting salvation. The Vaṭakalais believe that both Viṣṇu and Lakṣmī can grant mokṣa and they base their argument on *Viṣṇu purāṇam*²² and according to them Lakṣmī's redemptive mercy is omnipotent. She is not only the mediator (*puruṣakāra*) interceding and pleading for the pardon of the offences of the selves, but also the *upāya* along with Her Lord for the attainment of *mukti* by the *prapanna*. Our service after the attainment of *mukti* extends to Her as much as to *Bhagavān*. The Vaṭakalais say that *mithuna* or unity of the Lord and Śrī is vital to the seeker after salvation. Whatever be the ontological status of Lakṣmī, there is no doubt, that both the sects insist on Her *kṛpā* or mercy as essential to the final release. This beautiful concept is stated in a beautiful way: 'On the one hand, Lakṣmī subdues the retributive will of Īśvara by the beauty of Her enticing love and on the other She melts the heart of the sinner by Her infinite tenderness'.²³ As the link of love, She mediates between the finite that is important, and transforms the majesty of law into the might of mercy. It is perhaps strength (Father) is tempered by sweetness (Mother) and sweetness is supported by a strength; the one stimulates and the other persuades. The Vaṭakalai school depends its position on the following evidences: (a) The *Lakṣmītantra* contains a passage which means that the Lord together with Lakṣmī is the protector.²⁴ The word 'together' is to mean that Śrī protects the people as much as the Lord. This passage occurs in the context of finding a means for obtaining *mokṣa*. (b) Śrī is addressed as the *ātmavidyā* and described as awarding the results of *mokṣa*.²⁵ (c) Parāśara bhāṭṭar says that he would resort to Śrī at first and then to the Lord. He desires to do *kainkarya* to the Lord who is together with Lakṣmī. He qualifies the word 'Īśvara' here by the words 'as the means of the desired object'. He means evidently that both are the 'upāya'.²⁶ (d) Parāśara bhāṭṭar wrote a drama with the name *Lakṣmīkalyāṇa* in which Nammālvār is made to ask the Lord to take him under the refuge of Himself and Lakṣmī.²⁷ It may be added here that the Lord is referred to as Śrīmannārāyaṇa. Śrī is the attribute and Nārāyaṇa as having Śrī as his attribute. The

-
22. V.P. 1.9: 118. T.V.M. 4.5: 11 "Vēri mārāta pūmēl iruppāl viṇai tīrkkumē"— 'the occupant of the most fragrant lotus is the Mother, who will relieve us of all our sins and bless us'
23. "cētanānai aruḷālē tiruttum, Īśvarānai aḷakālē tiruttum" — Śrī Vacana Bhūṣaṇam 1:13.
24. L.T. 28: 14.
25. V.P. 1.9: 120.
26. *Aṣṭaśloki*, 6.
27. This is cited by Vedānta Deśikan in *Sārāsāra*, p. 46.

substantive and attribute may have independent ontological existence as in the case of blue lotus but as a metaphysical category, it must be only one. This is the way in which the Vaṭakalai school maintains its view.

6 *Vātsalya*: The Teṅkalais define this quality as the enjoyability of the defects of the jīvas. According to them the pardoning Lord is the God of the sinner and He seeks the evil-doer more than He does the sāttvika, as the target of his grace. They say that the Lord treats the sins committed by the selves as "enjoyable" like garland, sandal paste and others. He even relishes the the physical evil or *doṣa* in the prapanna like the mother who embraces with pleasure her dirt-stained child returning from play; or like the cow which licks the slime on the body of the new-born calf. Similarly God would consider even the faults, offences, and shortcomings of the self as agreeable (*bhogyā*).²⁸ To a lover, the dirt on the person of the beloved is far from being hateful. The Teṅkalais argue that it is the nature of the forgiveness of the Lord to welcome the sinner and not to penalise him for his wrongdoing. They support this theory of theirs by citing the *Rāmāyaṇam*.²⁹ The Vaṭakalais, on the other hand, believe that filial action (*vātsalya*) consists in not taking note of the *doṣa* of the jīvas; that is to say, the defects are ignored.³⁰ They point out that the admission of the view of the Teṅkalais would show that sins ought to be committed as they are to be "enjoyed" by God and expiation for the sins done need not be performed.

7 *Dayā*: The Teṅkalais hold that God's compassion consists in His getting afflicted on noticing that of others. That is to say, it is '*para duḥkhe duḥkhitvam*' entering into the sorrows of others and experiencing the suffering of others as one's own. They support this view by quoting the *Rāmāyaṇam*.³¹ To the Vaṭakalais, compassion or *dayā*, consists of an active sympathy on his part, as manifested in his desire to remove the suffering of others on account of His inability to bear such miseries. In the case of those who could not physically remove others' distress, it must be taken to mean entertainment of a desire to remove others' distress. It must include the removal of others' distress in the case of a person who has the power to do so. So, in the Vaṭakalai view, the Teṅkalai opinion amounts to saying that God will always be in suffering since all the living beings are mostly in a state of suffering. Agāin to suffer Himself at others' distress will have to be treated as a defect (*doṣa*) which would run counter to the concept of God as the

28 *Mumukṣup-paṭi*: caramaślokaprakaraṇam – sūt. 27.

29. Rām. 5. 18 : 3.

30. Śrī Srīnivāsa practices non-apprehension of the sins of His devotees. Vide: Vedānta Deśikaṇ . *Dayāśatakam*, 8.

31. Rām, 2.2: 40.

abode of suspicious qualities which are opposed to defects (heya pratya-nika). The passage from the *Rāmāyaṇam*, which is cited here must be taken to mean that Rāma was not in the least really affected but He was acting the role of a protector of people where the definition of the Teṅkalai would be applicable. This school seeks the evidence of Parāśara bhāṭṭar,³² Periyavāccāṇ Pillai³³ and Sudarśanasūri,³⁴ who interpreted dayā as inability to bear other's misery.

8. *Prapatti* · According to the Teṅkalais, prapatti consists in the absence of any initiative on the part of the individual, as God's love is spontaneous and will, of itself, bring salvation. Or, it may be taken to mean the knowledge of one's own self as the śeṣa of the Lord. They interpret prapatti not as a human endeavour, but a mere faith in the grace of God. A Jīva who is completely dependent upon God cannot practise it. The Vaṭakalais say that before resorting to self-surrender or prapatti there must be self-effort. It is only when this self-effort fails to lead to the realization of God, and in consequence a feeling of complete helplessness and unalloyed faith in God's grace is firmly entertained, that one can resort to prapatti. It is, therefore, in their view, in the form of practising the act of surrender of one's self. It does not consist in merely possessing the knowledge of one's dependence. The saying of the *upaniṣad* "With a desire to get released, I seek shelter",³⁵ the saying of *Bhagavadgītā* "you take shelter under Me alone"³⁶ and the saying of *Lakṣmī Tantra*, "The Lord expects from the jīva the need for protection"³⁷ support the act of surrender has to be practised. The paradox of prapatti śāstra arises from the Viśiṣṭādvaitic truth that the sarvaśeṣi is both the *upāya* and *upeya*, the means as well as the goal of vedāntic life, and it leads to the dualism between the spiritual effort of the jīva and the spontaneity of the divine grace. The Vaṭakalai school asserts that the soul must exert itself, show a contrition of heart and deathless faith in the Saviour, as the way of opening the flood gates of kṛpā and employs the analogy of the young monkey clinging to the mother for protection (markaṭa - nyāya) to illustrate the soul seeking refuge at the feet of the Saviour. The other party asserts that God's grace is like the care of the mother cat carrying the kitten in its

32. *Śrī Raṅgarājastavam*, 2. 98.

33. *Gadyatrayavyākhyānam*, p. 42.

34. *ibid* p 42

35. Sv. Up. 6 : 18.

36. Bh. G. 18 : 66

37. L.T. 17 : 78.

mouth (mārjāra-nyāya) which is independent of all efforts on the part of the latter illustrating that the soul requires no self-effort ³⁸

9. *Qualification to do prapatti*: As regards the person who is qualified for prapatti, the Teṅkalais base their authority on the *Gītā*. In the *Gītā* the Lord deals with various attributes as forming subsidiaries to devotion. Finally, He asks to give up all duties. This shows that one who follows this cannot have adequate confidence in devotion. Such a person alone, according to them, is fit to take the path of prapatti. Again they say that it is only those who study the *Prabandhams* can be fit to be called *prapannas*. But the Vaṭakalais hold that the qualifications to perform the act of self-surrender are having no other course to adopt, miserable position and inability to tolerate any delay on the part of a devotee. The main requirements for the course of *bhakti* or devotion are a clear philosophic knowledge of the realms of karma, jñāna and bhakti, the will rigorously to undergo the discipline in due order, and the sāt̥tvic patience to endure the ills of prārabdha karma till it is exhausted or expiated. Yāmuna declares, "I am not devoted to your feet. I have nothing and I have no other course adopt." ³⁹ This makes clear the relative qualifications for the paths of devotion and self-surrender. This does not in any way mean the lack of confidence in the path of devotion on the part of *mumukṣu*. They do not subscribe to the view that the mere reading of Tamil *Prabandhams* will make one a prapanna for, in that case, one who reads the Sanskrit passages in the *Upaniṣads* can become a devotee of God, which is utterly meaningless on the very face of it.

10. *Giving up the dharma*s: The Teṅkalais think that the person who adopts the path of prapatti should give up all scriptural duties assigned to the different stages of life (āśrama); for they argue it is well evidenced in the *Gītā* text that one should give up all one's religious duties and surrender oneself to God. "Abandoning all duties, come to Me alone for shelter" ⁴⁰ They opine that it is no offence at all for the prapanna to give up the performance of nitya and naimittika karmas ⁴¹ But the Vaṭakalais think that the scriptural duties which are obligatory should never be given up by those who have taken the course of self-surrender. ⁴² Whatever is done shall be attended with the giving up

38. There is a tendency among some of the philosophers to compare the Vaṭakalai and Teṅkalai views to the volitional type and the self-surrender type mentioned by William James in his *Varieties of Religious Experience*, and the Christian distinction between the justification by works and justification by faith. But the comparison is superficial as the distinction between those two types is entirely different from the Śrī Vaiṣṇavite views of sahetuka kaṭākṣa and nirhetuka kaṭākṣa.

39. *Stotratnam*, 22.

40. Bh. G. 18: 66.

41. *Mumukṣu-paṭi-caramaślokaprakaraṇam*-sūta 8.

42. Cf. Bh. G. 4: 32.

attachment to the result.⁴³ They further hold the view that the scriptural duties, being the commandments of God, should be performed for His satisfaction by these people. Otherwise, they would have to suffer for their negligence. Rāmānuja emphatically remarks that nitya and naimittika deeds are to be carried out as they are done to worship God.⁴⁴

11. Contradiction : According to the Teṅkalai view, the path of devotion is by nature contradictory to the jīva who is a śeṣa or one who is in tune with the will of God. The paths of duties and of knowledge assume an egoism which contradicts prapatti. The Vaṭakalais, however, say that the path of devotion is not in any way opposed to the nature of the self, but is opposed to only one's miserable condition. The so-called egoism is but a reference to our own nature as self, and not to *ahaṁkāra*, an evolute of matter.

12. Duties of castes : On the social side, the Teṅkalais feel that the acts of the *prapannas* are amoral and should not be judged by the moral standards applicable to the ordinary man following the rules of *varṇāśrama*, and the question of moral laxity, condemnation or condonation does not arise in their case. Duties prescribed by the *Dharmaśāstra* texts could however be carried out only for keeping the social status; but they are not binding on the *prapannas*. But the Vaṭakalais insist on the performance of *svadharma* or the duties relating to one's station in life even in the stage after *prapatti* as *kaiṅkarya*, and in conformity with the divine command. They support their view on the strength of *Lakṣmī Tantra*⁴⁵ according to which a learned man shall never violate the conduct prescribed in the *Vedas*; these duties have to be performed at any cost. The Lord declared that the *Vedas* and *Smṛtis* are His commands. Any one violating what one is ordained by them would become a sinner.⁴⁶

13 Accessories on the path of prapatti : The accessories of *prapatti* are counted as six.⁴⁷ The Teṅkalais hold that the man who adopts the path of *prapatti* has no desire to fulfil, and thus he may adopt any of these accessories according to his capacity and inclinations of his mind. The Vaṭakalais, however, think that even those who follow the path of *prapatti* are not absolutely free from any desire, since they wish to have *bhagavadanubhava*, and do service to God. Though they do not crave for the fulfilment of any other kind of need, it is obligatory upon them

43. Vide: *Bhagavadgītābhāṣya* on 18: 6.

44. Vide: *ibid* on 18: 5.9.

45. L.T. 17. 94.

46. Bh.G. 16 : 23.

47. L.T. 17 : 60, 61.

to perform all the six accessories as they have been ordained in the scheme.

14. *Cause for the act of self surrender*: On the strength of upaniṣadic saying⁴⁸ the Teṅkalais assert that God's grace could not be obtained by mere exposition of religious functions and hence the act need not be performed. But the Vaṭakalais insist that the act of prapatti has to be performed. Their argument is supported by a passage in the *Lakṣmī Tantra*, "This means is considered by Me as both easy and difficult".⁴⁹ They further argue that the passage quoted from *Muṇḍaka-Upaniṣad* must be taken to signify the importance of the Lord. It does not indicate that the act of self-surrender shall not be undertaken. If it were to convey this sense, then even jñāna-yoga will have to be given up, as there is always God who by Himself takes care of everything.

15. *Means of expiation*: The prapannas will have their sins absolved by God's forbearance even when they are done voluntarily. Therefore, the Teṅkalais say, there is no need to perform any act of expiation. This receives support from the *Gītā*⁵⁰ where the Lord declares that He would free the prapanna from all sins. But the Vaṭakalais insist that the act of expiation has to be done to get relief from the sinful acts done voluntarily. This will be the course when the prapanna has adequate facilities to perform them. According to them, repetition of the act of self-surrender shall be the course to be adopted only when the prapanna is helpless.⁵¹

16. *Adoration of bhāgavatas*: According to Teṅkalai ideal, the devotees of God shall be treated on a par with one another irrespective of the caste to which they belong. The prapanna is a bhāgavata and his spiritual worth is not in any way influenced by his birth and social status and it is one of the greatest offences to treat him with indifference, disregard, illwill or contempt on the ground of caste. The idea of service extends to all castes and outcastes irrespective of the social distinction determined by varṇāśrama ideal. They support their ideal on the strength of *Mahābhārata*.⁵² The Vaṭakalais say that though the devotees of God have certainly to be respected and should on no account be disregarded, the rules of caste which pertain to the body and not to the soul apply as long as the body endures and not annulled by the act of prapatti. There will, of course, be no difference in the attainment of

48. Muṇ. Up. 3.2 : 3.

49. L.T. 17 : 104.

50. Bh.G' 18: 66.

51. R.T.S. pp. 592, 595, 596.

52. MBh.: Āśramavāsikaparvām 108:- 32 c.f. ibid-106: 8.

mokṣa and there will be no such things as castes in *paramapada*, but as long as the body lasts, the *prapanna*, too, however great his devotion to God and however pure his life, has to follow the rules and regulations of castes in social life. "The temple cow is certainly more worthy than other cows in as much as its milk, butter and the like are used in the service of God, but on that account it does not cease to be a cow". Similarly, a man of a low caste shall be respected with the reverence due to a devotee as he is superior to all others in his caste.

17. *God's immanence* : The Teṅkalais say that God, owing to His immense capacity can enter into a soul which is atomic in size to accomplish acts which could not otherwise be accomplished. The Vaṭakalais assert that God is immanent in the *jīva* as its *antaryāmin* and there cannot be any place in the world, either animate or inanimate where God is not present, and hence there is no question of God entering any soul.

18. *Kaivalya* : This consists in having the experience of self alone, otherwise called self-realization. It may be called a flight of "the Alone to the Alone" in which the self enjoys inner quiet and is self-satisfied. It is different from God-realization. The Teṅkalais maintain the view that *kaivalya* is not a stage on the road of *mukti* but is *mukti* itself in which the *mukta* enjoys the 'peace that passeth understanding'. In this state the *mukta* belonging, of course, to an inferior class, is in some corner of *paramapada* and has no hope of intuiting God and enjoying the bliss of communion. But the Vaṭakalais favour the theory that *kaivalya* is only a stage on the path to perfection and those who cross it will eventually reach the divine goal.

There are other minor differences also that exist between these two sects. Differences of opinion came into being in many other points of practical importance, such as the extent to which pilgrimage could conduce to salvation, the duties of a *prapanna* if he was a *sannyāsin*, the details of ceremonials to be observed on certain special occasions, the extent of the purifying influence of contact with the *bhāgavatas*, the shape of sect mark, etiquette, certain restrictions regarding food and service, the relation between *sannyāsins* and householders, the tonsure of widows and so on and so forth. But they have little philosophical or religious basis or background.

The works of Teṅkalai school which are mostly in Tamil are complementary to those of the Vaṭakalais and not contradictory to them. The eighteen points of difference enumerated above can be reduced to the single problem of *kṛpā* versus *karma* in its aspect of the practice of *upāya*. If salvation is antecedent merit and justification by effort, it is said to involve more faith in the inexorability of the moral law of

karma than in the inescapability arising from divine grace. If salvation is by faith and antecedent of grace and guarantees the remission of sin without any condition like remorse, it is said to favour the faith in election and predetermination and the idea of divine arbitrariness which might lead to the toleration of moral laxity and chaos. Vedānta Deśikaṇ's view of *vyāja* or occasion seems to be a good reconciliation of the two extreme views. The Lord is Himself the *upāya* and the *upeya* and the true meaning of human responsibility consists in our responsiveness to the call of divine mercy. Even a gesture and change of heart and the feeling of unworthiness shown in an infinitesimal degree on the part of the sinner evokes sympathy and elicits the infinite grace of the Saviour. A spark of repentance destroys the whole load of *avidyā-karma* and thus an infinite series of karma is annihilated by infinitesimal effort. It is the recognition of the fact that endeavour consists in recognising the futility of endeavour. This view preserves the idea of divine justice and provides for the domination of divine grace which is its fruition. And if there is any difference between these schools it is in the starting point and not in the goal. It is, so to say, in the emphasis of aspects and not in the choice of opposing theories. If it is assumed that the human will is in any way free, it conflicts with divine determinism. It is difficult to take the dilemma by the horns or escape between them or rebut it. *Dayā* is neither won by effort nor forced on the individual soul. If the problem is restated in terms of *Śārtraka śāstra* or *Hetu śāstra* or logic, the distinction becomes philosophically negligible. *Kāṭakṣa* or grace is neither *sahetuka* nor *nirhetuka*. It is based on organic union. Mystic experience is alogical and amoral and it is illegitimate to apply logical and ethical terms to the transcendent law. The gift of grace and self-gift are virtually related like the systole and diastole of the heart; their relation involves reciprocity and responsiveness. The sucking of the mother's milk by the child is instinctively related to the spontaneous secretion of milk and the two form an organic process in the maintenance of life. It is impossible to divide this unitive process and decide how much it comes from the child and how much from the mother. Similarly, the *jñāni* is dearest to God, the *śārīrīn* and God is dearest to *jñāni*, the *śārīra*, and this organic relation is beyond logical analysis. *Dayā* pours itself fully into the self and the self flows irresistibly into *dayā*; and it is undesirable, so to say, to dissect this living flow into the logical categories of cause and effect.

In conclusion, we may say that the relation between righteousness and redemption in the working of God in the human history is a holy mystery which is more worthy of reverential study than analysis of logical categories or philosophical dogmas. The *karmakṛpā* riddle is the mystery of the religious experience and cannot be lightly dismissed

as theological dogma meant for the ignorant. The vexed problem cannot be solved either by logic or by ethics. It can be dissolved only by the direct intuition of God which is the experience of the Ālvārs. If such is the case, the distinction between the two schools regarding the working of *kṛpā* is a distinction without much difference.

SRI K.N. SRINIVASAN

VEDĀNTA DEŚIKA AND SIMHABHŪPĀLA

Tradition has it that the poet-philosopher Vedāntadeśika composed the *Subhāṣitanivī* and three small works of his at the request of or for the enlightenment of Siṃha nāyaka son of Mādhava. Studies have been undertaken to identify this Siṃha nāyaka but all the attempts have been concentrated on the history of the Āndhra territory. It appears that a person with the same name and of the same parentage closer to the seats of learning adorned by Deśika could be the person referred to by tradition.

Late Sri M.T. Narasiṃha ayyaṅgār of Central College, Bangalore in his introduction to the *Subhāṣitanivī* (Śrī Vāṇī Vilāsa Sanskrit Series, No. 10, 1908) refers to the popular tradition that 'this work was composed by the author for the benefit of Prince Sarvajña Siṅappa nāyaka who sought moral and religious instruction at his hands' and discredits the observation made by Professor Śeṣagiriśāstriar in his report on a search for Sanskrit and Tamil manuscripts 1896-97 (No. 1 - p. 9) identifying this prince with Sarvajña Siṅgama nāyaḍu or Siṃhabhūpāla, the author of the *Rasārṇavasudhākara*, who was one of the ancestors of Veṅkaṭagiri Rājas flourishing about A.D. 1330.

But Sarvajña Siṅgama nāyaḍu, according to Rao bahadur K. Vireśalingampantulu, (Telugu poets - Part I), was a contemporary of Prauḍha Dēvarāya of Vijayanagar (1442-1447). He was also the tenth in descent from the progenitor of the Veṅkaṭagiri-line of princes.

Bammera Pōtarāju the author of the Āndhra Mahā Bhāgavatamu, said to have been a poet of Siṅgama nāyaḍu and the Telugu poet Śrīnātha and Mallinātha the commentator of Kālidāsa are said to have attended his court.

'Vedāntadeśika lived only upto 1369 and therefore', according to Sri M. T. Narasiṃha ayyaṅgā, 'Prof. Śeṣagiri śāstriar's identification in question is untenable.'

Sri Narasiṃha ayyaṅgār, then, examines the pedigree (on page vii) of the Veṅkaṭagiri Rājas from the introductory chapter given in the *Rasārṇava sudhākara* according to which he is the son of Annapōta and Annamāmba, grandson of Siṅgaprabhu and great-grandson of Yācamānāyaka and concludes that Siṅgaprabhu the grandfather could have been the person to be identified as he could have been a contemporary of Vedānta deśika. He also draws support from a reference which has it that Anapōta reḍḍi (1340 to 1369) son of Anavēmareḍḍi, of the Reḍḍi rulers of Koṇḍaviḍu dynasty from Addaṅki was killed during the life-time of the latter (father) in a battle by Mādhava nāyaka of Veṅkaṭagiri. This Mādhava nāyaka or Mādā nāyaka was the son of Siṅgaprabhu (who was a contemporary of Vedānta deśika) and the father of the author of the *Rasārṇava sudhākara*.

But after reaching the conclusion on page nine, the learned author proceeds further and writes —

"Further in the commentary *Ratnapetikā*, we meet with the epithet *Rājamahendranagarasthita* as applied to this prince. If this be correct, we are led to suppose that Rajahmundry was under the authority of the Veṅkaṭagiri Rājas at the time of composition of the *Subhāṣitanīvi*. This poem cannot in that case be later than A.C. 1340, as the Reḍḍi rulers took possession of the country about that year. Considering, however, the style and matter of the work, I am inclined to place it between 1310 A.C. and 1320 A.C.

The author of this paper also inclined to place the work *Subhāṣitanīvi* between A.D. 1310 and 1335 a period during which Vedānta deśika had produced the maximum number of his philosophical writings, the earlier period of his life having been devoted to the study and the analysis and to the production of poetic works and the still later period being taken up in the consolidation and production of catechisms and of his *magnum opus*.

This identification of the person who came in contact with the poet-philosopher with Siṅgaprabhu is open to many objections. 'Siṅgaprabhu' has had a son Mādhava or *Māda* but not a father by that name. The concluding verse of the *Tattvasandēśa* mentions that the elucidation given in the work was by Deśika to the son of Mādhava

*idamiti nigamāntadeśikena
pratisamadiśyata mādhavātmaja ya*

The father of Siṅgaprabhu, according to the *Rasārṇavasudhākara*, was Anapōta and not Mādhava.

While the *Subhāṣitanivī* is a small garland, though a masterpiece of its kind, of didactical poems containing one hundred and forty four gems collected in twelve chapters having twelve verses each – analysing human beings after their character, moral ideas and philosophical ideas are set out in one and the same stanza by paronomasia (śleṣa) or allegory (anyāpadeśa). According to tradition, the three works, *Rahasya sandeśa* a short work explaining the vedic phrase ‘ahamātmā na deho’smi’; *Rahasya sandeśavivaraṇa* another short work explaining certain points in the earlier work and *Tattvasandeśa*, another short work devoted to explaining the introductory phrase in Śrī Rāmānuja’s *Śrīraṅgagadyam* were composed by Vedānta deśika for the benefit of the son of Mādhava. To quote the penultimate stanza of the last of the three works.

*trividhacidacidekatantra lakṣye
yatipati yāmuna bhāṣite ‘nuyoktuḥ |
idamitī nigamānta deśikena
pratisamadīśyata mādhavātmajasya ||*

“The son of Mādhava who was deeply interested in being initiated in the writings of Rāmānuja and Ālavandār (Yāmunācārya) was provided by Nigamāntamahādeśika with this clarification on the phrase beginning with *trividha cid acit*.

Should the epithet *sarvajña* be meaningful, (it should be so as is corroborated by its long and uncontroverted use) this Siṁhanāyaka would not have been satisfied with the three small books, which, judged by his standard expressed by his epithet, would be only elementary; what is worse, the *Subhāṣitanivī* is not the type of work which could have pleased Sarvajña Siṁhanāyaka. The author need not be mistaken to decry the standard or excellence of the work in any way).

Vedāntadeśika is said to have addressed the prince in the last stanza (which compares only with the sage Kaṇva’s parting advice to Śakuntalā) thus —

*sattvasthān nibhṛtaṁ prasādaya satāṁ vṛttīṁ vyavasthāpaya
trasya brahmavidāgasas tṛṇamiva traivargikān bhāvaya |
nitye śeṣiṇi niksīpan nījabharaṁ sarvaṁsahe śrisakhe
dharmāṁ dhāraya cātakasya kuśalin dhārādharaikāntinaḥ ||*

This stanza is apparently simple and its simpler meaning is adequate for a prince in advising him how one could lead the life of a *prapanna* (a dedicated soul), a king, though he be. Deśika is said to

have despatched the script of the *Subhāṣitanivī* and the three short works through the chosen scholar-messengers of the prince addressing him by the above quoted stanza of advice.

Having thus dismissed the attempt to identify the 'Mādhava's son' with Sarvajña Siṃha, the author of the *Rasārṇava sudhākara*, we shall now sift the other claims.

The case for identification of the person with Siṅgaprabhu of the Veṅkaṭagiri dynasty, who was the grandfather of Sarvajña Siṃha has also been discussed and dismissed already.

Except the two stanzas at the end of the *Tattvasandēśa* quoted above which indicate that the work was in response to an enquiry for the 'son of Mādhava' (Mādhavātmajasya) and that it was addressed to a king there is no further material available anywhere in the works of Vedāntadeśika to serve the purpose as internal evidence.

The *Vaibhava prakāśikā stuti* (a poem of one hundred and sixty six ślokaś beseeching the benevolence of the poet-philosopher) indicates the composition in hundred and twenty eighth stanza thus —

*suguṇā subhāṣitānām
mālā racitā mahātmanām prītyai |
nirmama suhṛdām viduṣā
nigamāntagurum bhajāmi tam nityam ||*

While this, the earliest of the eulogies of Vedāntadeśika (believed to have been composed shortly after the lifetime of the poet-philosopher) sung by a most 'filial' follower and powerful exponent of his philosophical treatises, Mahācārya, (popularly known as Caṇḍamārutam Doḍḍayācārya of cōlasīṃhapura) does not give any more details about it, the two works which took 'inspiration and material from Doḍḍayācārya's work give further details. They are the *Vedāntadeśikavaibhava prakāśikā*, a maṇipravāḷa work by Govindācārya or Periya Appaṅgār and *Guruparamparā prabhāva* of the third pontiff of *Parakālamatham* — both of which could not have been produced before the second quarter of the fifteenth century. The former of these describes the person to be identified as Sarvajña nāyaka, son of Mādhava who ruled from *Ekaśīlānagari Rajmahendra paṭṭaṇa*. The latter work gives the person's name as Sarvajña Siṅgappa nāyaka but does not mention either the name of his father or that he was a prince. These two books also mention that Siṃhanāyaka made enquiries (as to who was the best living exponent of Rāmānuja's system of philosophy) and then sent chosen śrīvaiṣṇavas (two according to the former and a few according to the latter) to Vedāntadeśika as the prince could not pay his respects in person to the poet-philosopher...

The *Ratnapetikā* commentary on the *Subhāṣitanivī* (by Śrīnivāsa) makes mention of the prince but the versions differ with different redactions of the manuscripts. Three versions are there – as follows :

- (i) the prince Siṅga in Rājamahendra nagara
- (ii) the prince Sarvajña Siṅga ruling in Rājamahendranagara
- (iii) the prince Sarvajña Siṅga

We know that the history of events in the fourteenth century in India was more confused than as it is accepted even now after long and considerable audit by historians. The sudden scourge of Mohammedan invasions which were more in the nature of plunder or dacoity than organised royal expeditions or conquests and the insecurity felt everywhere should have blurred the perceptibility of contemporary narrators if any; and more so where the scholars attached all importance to the teaching and material than to personalities and names. It is thus likely that the names have been introduced in these later works by conjecture taking the more prominent names in the history as recounted then. It is also significant to note that all of these three writers lived in the northern region of Tamilnad far removed from the place where the incident had occurred – the first writer at Cōlasimhapura (Śōḷṅgar) the second at Mysore and the third at Tirupati or Kāñchī.

Another paramount sovereign of the Āndhra circle whose name bears a close resemblance to Sīḥabhūpāla had combined in himself royal prowess and scholarship. He was the Yādava ruler of Devagiri, Siṅghaṇa son of Jaitrapāla. A commentary on Śārṅgadeva's *Saṅgitaratnākara* has been traced to him. This work had been earlier attributed to the pen of Sarvajña Siḥha, probably on account of the similarity of names. But it is impossible to consider this Siṅghaṇa for our case, as he ruled from A.D. 1210 and breathed his last in A.D. 1247 twenty two years before Vedāntadeśika was born.

But, who then is the Sīḥabhūpāla or Mādhava's son who had betaken to the discipleship of Vedāntadeśika ?

Every student of history knows that the Hoyasaḷa monarch Biṭṭidēva of Dvārasamudra was converted to Śrīvaiṣṇava faith by Śrī Rāmānuja and was thenceforth known as Viṣṇuvardhana. With the fall of the Cōla empire, Viṣṇuvardhana was doubtless the greatest emperor of South India. He and his successors made distinct contributions to the expansion and progress of the Vaiṣṇava movement in South India. A number of temples dedicated to Viṣṇu came into being and a number of inscriptions dating between 1311 and 1340 in Avināśi, Bhavāni, Coimbatore, Gōpicetṭipālayam and Erode taluks would show that the Koṅṇaṇāḍu was then under the undisputed suzerainty of the Hoyasaḷas.

During this period the Hoyasaḷa monarch was Viraballāḷa or Ballāḷa III. In the history of the Hoyasaḷas their generals held positions of colossal importance and were household names with citizens as the monarchs themselves were.

Perumāl daṇḍanāyaka was a devoted general of Viṣṇuvardhana. His name itself suggests that the Perumāl could have migrated from the Tamil country, because the name Perumāl is a purely Tamil name. Perumāl's son was Mādhava daṇḍanāyaka whose name was also prominent among the Hoyasaḷas' generals. Mādhava had many epithets to his name such as *mahāpradhāni* and *paramaviśvāsi*. He had founded the castle at Daṇḍāyakkāṅkōṭṭai in the Gōpicēṭṭipāḷayam taluk from where he virtually ruled as a representative of the Hoyasaḷa monarchs. Innumerable donations and benefactions in his name are witnessed among the Vaiṣṇavite. He had two sons Kētaya and Siṅgaya or Siṅgaṇa both have made liberal endowments to the temples. Mādhava and his sons are said to have been in charge of fourteen countries with their capital at Terkanambi. Kētaya is said to have endowed properties for conduct of worship in Viṣṇu shrines for the welfare of his brother Siṅgaṇa. From all these one thing is clear and it is that Siṃhanāyaka or Siṅganāyaka like his brother, father and grandfather must have been an ardent devotee of Viṣṇu and it is no wonder that he betook to the feet of an *acārya* of the stature of Vedānta deśika.

It is already settled among the historians that Vedāntadeśika had to flee Śrīraṅgam in A.D. 1327 when the holy town was ravaged by the Mohammedan bands. Lokācārya accompanied the utsava deity of Raṅganātha (Namperumāl) in a southerly direction and Vedāntadeśika fled to the west taking with him the philosophical manuscripts and in particular the *Śrutaprakāśikā* (commentary on *Śribhāṣya*) of Sudarśana-bhaṭṭar along with the latter's two young sons. It is also certain that for a considerable part of the Mohammedan interregnum at Śrīraṅgam, Vedāntadeśika lived in Satyakālam which has been distinguished from Satyamaṅgalam and identified with a place near Kollekālam. It was over this area that the Hoyasaḷa general Siṃhadaṇḍanāyaka virtually ruled during the second quarter of the fourteenth century. Further this area never attracted the attention of the Mohammedan invaders. It is a matter of adding two and two to affirm that the *Subhāṣita nivā* and the three small works mentioned above besides many other compositions could have been composed in this calm and serene atmosphere.

There may still be one apparent hurdle in identifying this Hoyasaḷa general as the personality referred to in the traditional accounts of the life of Vedāntadeśika. The *Vaiḍhava prakāśikā*, *Guruparamparā* and the *Ratnapreṭikā*, commentary mentioned above all state that the initia-

tion of the ruler by Vedāntadeśika was through the medium of certain śrīvaiṣṇavas and not in person. But in Dodḍayācārya's stuti there is no mention even of the name of the prince. As the writer has shown in the earlier part of this study, it will not be unreasonable to agree with the writer that authors of these three works should have taken a ruler by name Siṃhanāyaka for granted, tried to connect one of the historical figures of that name with the theme and should have invented the medium of 'two' or 'few' śrīvaiṣṇavas to explain how the ruler of Deccan could have communicated with the great ācārya.

The three small works mentioned above are in *maṇipravāḷa* style—the compositions are thus basically Tamil with a few Sanskrit words woven into their text and a knowledge of Tamil is essential to read and understand the works. An Āndhra ruler who never came to the South or who never knew Tamil could not have come into such literary correspondence with Vedāntadeśika. To him nothing in these works could have been useful. From this point of view also, identification of Siṃhabhūpāla with Siṅga daṇḍanāyaka, son of Mādhavamahāpradhāni would be nearer truth than of thinking him to be an Āndhra ruler.

The penultimate verse of the *Tattvasandēśa* quoted above merely narrates that "thus Mādhava's son was given enlightenment (or clarification)". This may as well point out to a personal meeting of Mādhava's son Siṅga daṇḍanāyaka and Vedāntadeśika. Unlike Sarvajña Siṃha this Siṅga daṇḍanāyaka does not appear to be a poet or one with a lot of learning, but he appears to be just a devotee of Viṣṇu and one greatly interested in contributing his mite to the propagation or expansion of Rāmānuja's system of philosophy in the world.

One more reading of the entire subject drives to the following conclusion :—

Mādhava's son Siṃhadaṇḍanāyaka, the lord of the fourteen territories with the capital at Terkanambi should have received Vedāntadeśika into the territory and have spent some time at his feet. To a general who had to be busier than the monarch himself in the administration of the state, there would not have been much time to learn the works meant for a paṇḍit at the feet of Vedāntadeśika. The general should have been initiated with the *gadyas* and a detailed exposition by Vedāntadeśika could have been commenced but stopped or given up soon either for the reason of low receptivity in the general or for paucity of time for the general. This conclusion fits in well with the fact that at the end of these three minor works, Vedāntadeśika gave him a verse containing the most practical teaching in simple terms for a ruler accompanied by a didactic piece of poetry, namely, the *Subāṣitanivī*.

Dr. UMAKANT THAKUR

MOUNTAINS AND RIVERS OF SOUTH INDIA AS PROVIDED IN THE SKĀNDA PURĀṆA

Anantagiri: This is a mountain spoken of by none of the modern scholars so far. However, as it finds mention in the *Veṅkaṭācala-māhātmya* of the *Skānda purāṇa* it may be conjectured to be situated in the vicinity of the *veṅkaṭācala*. A pond named *devatirtha* is said to be located thereon.¹

Añjanādri: It is also known as *añjanācala*. It is identical with *veṅkaṭācala*. It is ascertained that in *satyayuga* at the request of Vṛṣabhāsura *veṅkaṭācala* was named as *vṛṣabhācala* and in *trētāyuga* it was known as *añjanācala* as *añjanā*, the mother of Hanumān practised penance here. In *dvāpara* it was known as *śeṣācala* and in *kaliyuga* it is named as *veṅkaṭācala* since it removes all sins.²

Āraṇi: This is a river near Nārāyaṇapurī³ in the vicinity of *veṅkaṭādri*.⁴ Its western bank is full of trees.⁵ The phallus of Agastyeśvara is also situated very near to it.⁶

Aruṇācala: According to the *Skānda purāṇa*,⁷ *aruṇācala* is situated in the *drāviḍa* (i.e., the Deccan) country. Its extent is said to be twenty four miles. It is held that the Lord Śiva resides here in the form of this mountain. It is the abode of all the deities and semi-gods.

-
1. SK. Vai. Veṅ. M. 17. 1. 79-80.
 2. Tīrthāṅka, P. 508.
 3. Sk. Vai. Veṅ. M. chapter 5, Verse 46.
 4. ibid. chapter 5.
 5. ibid. 5.62.
 6. ibid. 5. 63-64.
 7. Sk. Ma. A.ch. M.U. 4 - 10-14.

It is treated as superior to *sumeru*, *kailāsa* and *mandarācala*. The Tirthāṅka (Page 352) also refers to it and identifies it with modern *tiruvannāmalai* in South India. *Tiruvannāmalai* is said to be the Tamil name of *aruṇācala*. As regards the mention of this mountain in the *purāṇas* the *Tirthāṅka* refers to the *Skānda purāṇa*, but the references given therein seem to be wrong.⁸

It is situated at a distance of six furlongs from the Tiruvannāmalai station,⁹ which stands at a distance of forty two miles from Villupuram on the Villupuram-Gūdūr line. The *Skānda purāṇa* further reveals that in the beginning this mountain was in the form of fire.¹⁰ It was like the colour of copper and hence it is also known as *śoṇācala*, as the text shows. After the prayer of the deities it changed its previous form and took the present one. It is known by different names¹¹ in the different ages viz, in *kṛtayuga* it is known as *agnimayaśaila*, in *trētā - maṇi-parvata*, in *dvāpara - haṭakagiri*, and in *kaliyuga - marakatācala*. In *kṛtayuga* it was all fire and when the sages rounded it from outside, then it became cold. *Aruṇācala* is said to be situated to the south of *śoṇādri*.¹²

Bhṛgu: The mountain Bhṛgu is said to be situated on the south of *revā*. Sūlabheda, a place of pilgrimage is situated on it.¹³ Mr. Dey's *bhṛgutūṅga*¹⁴ is not identical with this. Dr. Kane, however, refers to one *bhṛgutūṅga*¹⁵ near *amarakaṇṭaka* which may be identified with this *bhṛgu parvata*.

Citrakūṭa: This is one of the fifteen rivers rising from the *ṛkṣa-pāda*.¹⁶ The *Vāyu* (45-99) and the *Matsya* (14-25) *purāṇas* also mention it likewise.¹⁷ Mr. Dey identifies it with *payasvini*.¹⁸

Citrotpalā: It rises from mountain *ṛkṣapāda*.¹⁹ The *Brahma-purāṇa* (27, 31-32) also supports what the *Skānda purāṇa* says in this

-
8. The Tirth. (page 6, Foot No. 8) refers to chapter 3 instead of ch. 4. of *Aruṇācala māhātmya*.
 9. Tirth. P. 353.
 10. Sk. Ma. A.ch. M.P. 7. 8-16.
 11. ibid. P. 7. 3-5.
 12. ibid. U. 4. 29.
 13. Sk. Ava. Reva. 44. 8-9.
 14. Geog. Dic. 34.
 15. Hist. Dns. IV. 739.
 16. Sk. Ava. Reva. 4. 45-48.
 17. Hist. Dns. IV. 744.
 18. Geog. Dic. 50.
 19. Sk. Ava. Reva. 4. 45-48.

respect. Mr. Dey identifies it with *citropalā*,²⁰ the river *mahānadi* in Orissa.

Daṇḍādri : According to the *Skānda purāṇa* *daṇḍādri* is the western part of *aruṇācala* or *śoṇācala*.²¹

Dardura parvata : The name of this mountain finds mention in the *Skānda purāṇa*²² in association with the other mountains of India. But its location is not evident in this *purāṇa*. However, the name occurs in several other *purāṇas*²³ also and accordingly it has been identified with the *nilagiri* hills. Mr. Dey also observes that it is the *nilagiri* hills in Madras State.²⁴

Daśārṇā : It is mentioned as one of the fifteen tributaries of the river *gaṅgā*. It takes its rise from the *ṛkṣapāda* mountain. Wilson identifies it with the modern Dasān,²⁵ which rises in Bhopal and falls into the Betwa. It flows through the country of Daśārṇa,²⁶ the eastern part of Mālāvā, its capital being Vidiśā, the modern Bhilsa situated on the *vetravatī* or Betwa (Megh. I 24-25). Mr. Dey also refers to and locates it as said above.²⁷

Eraṇḍi saṅgama : This is a place of pilgrimage on the north bank of the *narmadā*.²⁸ It is said to be the purifier of sins.²⁹ The *Matsya* (191.42; 193.65) and the *Padma* (I 18. 41) *purāṇas*³⁰ refer to *eraṇḍīrtha* as a river being the tributary of the *narmadā* in Baroda territory which is called *uri* or *or*. The word itself indicates that it is the confluence of the river *eraṇḍi* with the *narmadā*. Hence it may be identified with the *eraṇḍi-narmadā-saṅgama* as evinced by the *Matsya* (194. 32), the *Kūrma* (II 41.85; 42.31) and the *Padma* (I 18 41) *purāṇas*.³¹

Gandhamādana : The *Skānda purāṇa*³² holds that Badarīnātha is situated on the mountain of *gandhamādana*. (See *Gandhamādana* in

20. Geog. Dic. P. 50.
21. Sk. Ma. A.ch M 4-28.
22. Sk. Ma. ke. 30. 32-35.
23. Ref. by His. Dhs. IV. 745.
24. Geog. Dic. p. 53.
25. Ref. by Hist. Dhs. IV. 745
26. Skt. Eng Dic. Page 662.
27. Geog. Dic. Page 54.
28. Sk. Ava. Reva. 103.3.
29. ibid. 217.1.
30. Hist. Dhs. IV. 751.
31. ibid.
32. Sk. Vai. B. M. 4. 3.

North India also.³³ It is further said to be located in South India, and is associated with *rāmeśvaraliṅga* at Setubandha.³³ Mr Dey also says that a portion of this mountain was brought by Hanumān.³⁴ It is pointed out that Rāmeśvaram in South India. The *Skānda purāṇa*, further, locates it in Saurāṣṭra.³⁵

Gaṅgā : The *Skānda purāṇa*³⁶ mentions it as the holiest river in the three worlds. It has fifteen tributaries namely – *śoṇa*, *mahānada*, *mandākinī*, *daśārnā*, *citrakūṭā*, *tamasā*, *vidaśa*, *karabhā*, *yamunā*, *citrotpalā*, *viprāśā*, *rañjanā* and *vāluvāhini* – all rising from the *ṛkṣa* mountain.³⁷ *Gaṅgā* flowing to the South is known as the *narmadā* or the *dakṣiṇa gaṅgā*.³⁸

Ghaṭikācala : Besides *ghaṭikācala*, *aruṇādri*, *hastisaila*, and *gr̥dhrādri* too are situated in the South,³⁹ and in the vicinity of *kṣīranadī*. Dr. Law refers to it and places it at Sholinghur in the North Arcot District.⁴⁰

Godāvarī : This is a very sacred and renowned river in South India.⁴¹ It issues from *brahmagiri* which is situated on the side of a village named Tryambaka existing at the distance of twenty miles from Nāsik.⁴² Its length is said to be two hundred *yojanas*.⁴³ It is called *gautamī* also in the *Brahma purāṇa*.⁴⁴ Dr Kane has dusted several pages in regard to it.⁴⁵ It is the largest and longest river in South India. According to Dr. Law it rises from the western ghats. It takes its source in the Nāsik hills of the Bombay State and cuts through a good portion of the Āndhra State.⁴⁶ He says that it is about nine hundred miles in length. It falls into the Bay of Bengal in the district of Godāvari.⁴⁷

33. Sk. Bra. Sc. M. 1-27.

34. Geog. Dic. 60.

35. Sk. Pra. V. kṣe. 16. 82-84.

36. Sk. Ava. Reva. 4. 45-49.

37. ibid. chapter 6.

38. ibid.

39. Sk. Vai. Ven. M. 1. 41-42.

40. Hist. Geog. 152.

41. Sk. Vai. Ven. M. 22. 25-33.

42. Geog. Dic. 69-70.

43. Hist. Dhs. IV. 707.

44. ibid.

45. ibid. 707-711.

46. Hist. Geog. 37.

47. ibid.

Gokarnagiri: It is a mountain on which Rāvaṇa is said to have performed austerities.⁴⁸ Mr. Dey identifies it with the modern Gomukhī, two miles beyond Gaṅgotrī.⁴⁹ The identification of Gokarna with Gomukhī⁵⁰ is supported by Dr B C. Law also. It is a large rock called cow's mouth by the Hindus from its resemblance to the head and body of that animal.⁵¹

Gr̥dhrādri: The name occurs in association with *aruṇādri*, *hastīśaila*, and *ghaṭikācala* in South India.⁵² Mr Dey⁵³, Dr. Kane⁵⁴, Dr. Law⁵⁵ and Cunningham⁵⁶ refer to its namesake which is located under Gayā and hence not identical with this.

Hastīśaila: This is a hill situated in South India. The name occurs in association with *aruṇādri*, *gr̥dhrādri*, and *ghaṭikācala* (q.v.)⁵⁷ The river *suvarṇamukharī* stands forty miles north of it, on the north bank of which exists *kamalāsarovara*. The *Veṅkaṭācala* stands five miles to the north of *kamalāsara*. Thus it may be located to the south of *veṅkaṭācala*⁵⁸ at a distance of about forty-five miles from it.

Hāṭakagiri: Same as *Aruṇācala* (q.v.).

Kalyāṇadī: This is a river near the holy river *suvarṇamukharī* said to be as holy as the *kālindī* and the *jāhnavī*.⁵⁹ The *kalyā* issues from *vṛṣabhācala*.⁶⁰ The *kalyā* is praised as the best of all the rivers. Both the banks of this river are said to have been thickly covered with trees and creepers of various types and are a very comfortable place for hermits whose hermitages abound in this place. The *veṅkaṭācala*⁶¹ is said to be at a distance of half a yojana north from the confluence of *suvarṇamukharī* and *kalyā*, the height of which is one yojana.

Kṛṣṇaveṇī: This is a river in South India in the vicinity of *veṅkaṭācala*.⁶² Dr. Kane identifies it with the confluence of *kṛṣṇā* and *veṇyā*⁶³ and says that it issues from the *sahya* mountain.

48. Sk. Ma. ke. 8. 44

49. Geog. Dic. 70

50. Hist. Geog. 80.

51. Geog. Dic. 71.

52. Sk. Vai. Veṇ. M. 1. 41-42

53. Geog. Dic. 72.

54. Hist. Dhs. IV. 755.

55. Hist. Geog. 220-221.

56. A.G. page 534.

57. Sk. Vai. Veṇ. M. 1. 41-42.

58. ibid. 42-46.

59. ibid. 35-1

60. ibid. 35. 2-3.

61. ibid. 35. 11-12.

62. ibid. 44-48.

63. Hist. Dhs. IV. 771.

Karabhā: This is one of the fifteen tributaries of the river *gaṅgā*.⁶⁴ All of them have originated from God Rudra and they take their rise from *rkṣapāda* mountain (q.v.). The river *karabhā* is so called because she brilliantly shines while she flows on⁶⁵ as the moon shines at night with her flowing rays.

Kāverī. According to the *Skānda purāṇa*⁶⁶ it is a holy river in South India. A bath in it in the month of *kārtika* would bring one great merit.⁶⁷ Some of the *purāṇas* and the epics⁶⁸ are of opinion that it rises in the *sahya* mountain in South India. This river is also known as the *dakṣiṇa gaṅgā*.⁶⁹ Dr. B.C. Law explains that it starts from Coorg and passes through the districts of Coimbatore and Trichinopoly and falls into the Bay of Bengal.⁷⁰

Kāveri saṅgama: This is the confluence of the *kāverī* and the *narmadā*. Here Kubera is said to have obtained *siddhi*. It is regarded as a very holy place for pilgrimage.⁷¹

Mahānada: This is one of the fifteen tributaries of the sacred river *gaṅgā*.⁷² It is said to have issued from the mountain *rkṣapāda* (q.v.) and thought to be very sacred and remover of all sins.

Mahārṣyā: It finds mention nowhere else than in the *Skānda purāṇa*.⁷³ It is one of the tributaries of the sacred river *gaṅgā* and may be identical with the river *mahānada* (q.v.) The *Tīrthāṅka*⁷⁴ refers to one *mahānadi*, which is said to be situated in the South. Both of them seem to be identical.

Mahendra: According to the *Skānda purāṇa* it is one of the mountains which are regarded as the phalli of God Śiva himself. They are described as the destroyers of sins. This mountain range consists of *śrīśaila*, *mahendra*, *sahyācala*, *mālyavān*, *malaya*, *vindhya*, *gandhamādana*, *śvetakūṭa*, *trikūṭa*, and *dardura parvata*.⁷⁵ Mr Dey observes

64. Sk. Ava. Revā. 4. 45-49.

65. ibid. 6. 43.

66. Sk. Vai. Veñ. M. 25. 6-22.

67. ibid. 4. 50-53.

68. Ref by Hist. Dhs. IV. 767.

69. Nṛsiṃha P. 66-7.

70. Hist. Geog. 162.

71. Sk. Ava. Revā. 29. 8-9.

72. ibid. 4. 45-49.

73. ibid. 6.35

74. The Special Number of Kalyāṇ, year 31, Page 332.

75. Sk. Ma. Ke. 31. 92-94.

that the whole range of hills extending from Orissa to the district of Madura was known by the name of *mahendra parvata* ⁷⁶ Dr. Kane reveals that in the Ganjam district there is a peak called *mahendragiri* about 5,000 feet high ⁷⁷ It also finds mention in Allahabad stone pillar inscription of Samudragupta. ⁷⁸

Malāpahānadi : The name occurs in the *Skānda purāṇa* ⁷⁹ while describing the pilgrimage of Arjuna from *bhāgīrathī* to *suvarṇamukhari*. Just after *malāpahā* the name *kṛṣṇaveṇī* comes and evidently it seems to be situated in South India. ⁸⁰ Dr. Kane also refers to it as a river in the South and says that the town *Munipaiṇā* by name is situated on its bank where there is *Pañcaliṅga Maheśvara*. ⁸¹

Malayācala : In the *Skānda purāṇa* the name occurs in association with *mahendra*, *śrīśaila*, *vindhya*, *pāriyātra* and *yamālaya*. ⁸² It is described as one of the seven mountains of India called *Kūlaparvatas*. ⁸³ It is renowned as one of the principal mountains of India. ⁸⁴ Mr. Dey ⁸⁵ identifies it with the southern parts of the western ghats south of the river *kāveri*. ⁸⁶

Mandākinī : The name of the river *mandākinī* appears in the *Skāndapurāṇa* in connection with the description of the origin and different stages of the river *narmadā* ⁸⁷ which is said to be originated from the body of God Rudra. As to the significance of the name it is stated that the river *narmadā* while flowing to the South originating from the body of God Rudra flowed very slowly near the tree of Kalpa and hence it is so called. Dr. Kane mentions it locating it near mountain *citrakūṭa* rising from *ṛkṣavat*

Maṇiparvata . Same as *Aruṇācala* (q.v.).

Marakatācala : Same as *Aruṇācala* (q.v.).

Narmadā : According to the *Skānda purāṇa*, *narmadā* and *revā* are identical. ⁸⁸ It rises from the body of Rudra and hence it is called

76. Geog. Dic. 119.

77. Hist. Dhs. IV. 777.

78. C.I.I. Vol. III. p. 7.

79. Sk. Vai. Veṇ. M. 29. 39-48.

80. ibid. 29.44.

81. Hist. Dhs. IV. 778.

82. Sk. Ava. A.C.L.M 3-12.

83. Sk. Ma. Kau. 39. 112.

84. Sk. Ma. Ke. 30. 32-35.

85. Geog. Dic. 112.

86. ibid. 171.

87. Sk. Ava. Reva. 6. 23-45.

88. ibid. chapters 1, 2, 5, 6.

rudra sambhava.⁸⁹ It is said that the holy river *gaṅgā* flows towards all the directions - with its fifteen tributaries rising from the mountain *phṣṣapāda*. According to the *Skānda purāṇa* the river *narmadā* does not cease to flow even at the end of the seven *kalpas* and hence it is called *Narmadā*.⁹⁰ As to the origin of the name *narmadā*, it is said that once the demigods were enjoying merriments by dancing and clapping their hands when suddenly a girl was seen before Lord Śaṅkara. Seeing her, the demigods were astonished. Then the bow-holder (Lord Śiva) observed - "As merriment has been given by her activities, separately, she will be a holy river known as *narmadā* - giver of merriment or amorous pastime."⁹¹

Nārāyaṇagiri or *Nārāyeṇādri*. The *Veṅkaṭacalamāhātmya* of the *Skānda purāṇa* deals with it. The *nārāyaṇagiri* is the name of *veṅkaṭācala*⁹² (q.v.), which is situated in the Drāviḍa country. It is recorded that the same mountain is known by different names in the different ages⁹³ such as - in *kṛtayuga* - *añjanādri*, in *tretā* - *nārāyaṇagiri*, in *dvāpara* - *siṃhaśaila* and in *kaliyuga* it is known as *sri-veṅkaṭācala*. It is also called *paramātmālayagiri*.⁹⁴ It is ascertained that there are sixty-six crores of *tīrthas* on this holy mountain.⁹⁵ On this mountain mainly seven *tīrthas* lie which are auspicious.⁹⁶ They are - *cakratīrtha*, *devatīrtha*, *viyaḍgaṅgā*, *kumārādhārikā*, *pāpanāśana*, *pūṇḍava* and *svāmī-puṣkariṇi*. It is said that one who salutes this mountain even from far away with regards, is released from all sins and goes to the residence of God Viṣṇu.⁹⁷

Paramātmālaya: Same as *Nārāyaṇagiri*.

Pinākini: The name occurs while describing the pilgrimage of Aṣṭa to *suvarṇamukharī* at *veṅkaṭācala* in the South.⁹⁸ The description shows that the river *pinākini* flows somewhere in between *śrīparvata* and *veṅkaṭācala*. The location of *śrīparvata* is obvious here at the river *kṛṣṇaveni* i.e., *kṛṣṇā*.⁹⁹ Mr Dey has rightly identified it with the river *pennār* in Andhra State.¹⁰⁰

89. *ibid.* 1. 11.

90. *ibid.* 2. 55.

91. *ibid.* 5. 45-48.

92. *Sk Vai Veṅ. M.* 1. 50-62 ff.

93. *ibid.* verses 60-61.

94. *ibid.*

95. *ibid.* verse 56.

96. *ibid.* 1. 51-52.

97. *ibid.* 1. 62.

98. *ibid.* 29. 39-48.

99. *ibid.* 29. 44-46.

100. *Geog. Dic.* 157.

Rañjanā : It is identical with *narmadā*. Since a visit to this river pleases the pilgrims it is called *rañjanā*.¹⁰¹ The name is derived from the root *rañj* - 'to please'. It rises from *ṛkṣapāda* mountain (q.v.) It is said to be one of the fifteen rivers that originated from the body of Rudra.¹⁰²

Ṛṣabha : According to the *Skānda purāṇa* this mountain is situated to the south of *meru* and to the north of *dugdhakuṇḍa*.¹⁰³ Here stands the lake named *ramyasara* (q.v.).

Revā : The river is so sacred that it covers a special chapter in *Āvantikhaṇḍa* of the *Skānda purāṇa*. It is identical with *narmadā*. *bhṛgu-āśrama* and *śuklatīrtha* are said to stand at *revā*.¹⁰⁴

Ṛkṣapāda : It is also known as *ṛkṣasāila*.¹⁰⁵ mountain. The name occurs in the *Skānda purāṇa* while describing the source of *narmadā*. It is said that *narmadā* went to the South by the order of the God Śiva, taking its rise in the *ṛkṣasāila*. There are fifteen rivers which are said to have taken their sources in this mountain. They are - *śoṇa*, *mahānada*, *narmadā*, *surasā*, *mandākinī*, *daśārṇā*, *citrakūṭā*, *tamasā*, *vidaśā*, *karabhā*, *yamunā*, *citrotpalā*, *vipāśā*, *rañjanā* and *vāluvāhinī*. All these are said to have originated from the body of Rudra.¹⁰⁶ Dr. B.C. Law refers to it as *ṛkṣavat*.¹⁰⁷ According to him it is the ancient name of the modern *vindhya* mountain. It is identical with Ouxenton of Ptolemy, who identifies it with the central region of the modern *Vindhya* range north of the *narmadā*.¹⁰⁸

Ṛṣyamūkagiri : The *Skānda purāṇa* ascertains that in search of Śītā, Rāma went to *pampā* from *pañcavaṭī* and from there he reached *ṛṣyamūkagiri*. Thereafter he went to Dundubhi and with Sugrīva and Lakṣmaṇa again started for Kiṣkindhā.¹⁰⁹ Mr. Dey observes that this mountain is situated eight miles from Ānegondi on the bank of *tungabhadrā*.¹¹⁰ The river *pampā* rises in this mountain and falls into the *tungabhadrā* after flowing westward. The *Tirthāṅka* (p. 305-307) holds that the road which is before the Virūpākṣa temple leads to this mountain. The river *tungabhadrā* flows here in the shape of a bow.

101. Sk. Ava. Reva. 6. 43-44.

102. ibid. 4. 45-49.

103. Sk. Ava. Akṣe. M. 70. 1-2.

104. Sk. Ma. Kan. 3. 3-5.

105. Sk. Ava. Reva. 6. 25-26.

106. ibid. 45-49.

107. Hist. Geog. 328.

108. ibid.

109. Sk. Bra. Se. M. 2. 6-18.

110. Geog. Dic. 169.

Sahyācala : According to the *Skānda purāṇa* it is one of the mountains which are treated as the phallus of Lord Śiva.¹¹¹ It may be identified with *sahyādri* of Mr. Dey, which is said to be same as the northern parts of the western ghats, north of the river *kāverī*. Dr Law observes that the western ghats were known to the ancients as *sahyādri*, which form the western boundary of the Deccan.¹¹²

Śālagrāma : The name occurs in connection with the pilgrimage of a brahmin of South India.¹¹³ But the location is not clear here in the *Skānda purāṇa*.¹¹⁴ It is said that Śālagrāma hill is Viṣṇu.¹¹⁵ It is further said to be one of the important mountains of India,¹¹⁶ and is situated in the South.¹¹⁷

Śeṣācala : It is also known as *śeṣādri* or *śeṣagiri*. It seems to be a peak of the *veṅkaṭācala*,¹¹⁸ which is situated on the bank of *suvarṇa-mukhari* in the South. Mr. Dey also refers to it and identifies it with Tirumala¹¹⁹ and Tirupati.

Siṃhādri : It is one of the important mountains of the South India.¹²⁰ It may be identified with the *siṃhācala* of the *Tīrthāṅka* (p. 334). According to it Siṃhācalam station is situated on the Howrah-Waltair lines, five miles before Waltair. The hills stand at a distance of two and a half miles from the station. The altitude of this place is eight hundred feet. It is situated at ten miles to the north of Viśākhapaṭṭaṇam. It is said that Hiraṇyakaśipu, throwing down his son Prahlāda into the ocean, kept this mountain on him, but God Viṣṇu saved him by lifting the mountain in his hand.¹²¹

Skandanadī : This river is located to the north of the mountain Aruṇācala.¹²² This is said to be sacred. Skanda is said to have taken a bath in it.¹²³

111. Sk. Ma. Ke. 31. 92-94.

112. Hist. Geog. 186.

113. Sk. Vai. Veṅ. M. 10. 51-52.

114. ibid. verses 60-62.

115. Hist. Dhs. IV 799.

116. Sk. Vai. Veṅ. M. 1. 37-42.

117. Tīrtha. 334.

118. Sk. Vai. Veṅ. M. 9. 19-22.

119. Geog. Dic. 184.

120. Sk. Vai. Veṅ. M. 1. 40-41.

121. Tīrth p. 334.

122. Sk. Ma. Ach. M. p. 6. 120-125.

123. ibid. verse 125.

Śoṇa : While describing the origin of the Narmadā, the name of the river *śoṇa* is mentioned in the *Skānda purāṇa*. It is said that as the drops fell down from the *śūla* (trident) of the God Śiva while he was observing penance, the river was known as *śoṇa*.¹²⁴ It has taken its source from the *ṛkṣa* mountain (q v.)

Śoṇācala or *Śoṇādri* : Vide *Aruṇācala*.

Śrīśaila or *Śrīparvata* : It is described as one of the *līṅga parvatas* of India¹²⁵ but as to its location no clear reference is found in the *Skānda purāṇa*. Dr. Kane says that it is a hill situated in Kurnool district on the south side of the *kṛṣṇā* river fifty miles from Kṛṣṇa station.¹²⁶

Svāmipuṣkarinī : It is also known as *svāmītīrtha* and *svāmī-sarovara*. It is said to be situated on the bank of the *suvarṇamukharī* on *veṅkaṭagiri*.¹²⁷ Veṅkaṭeśvara is said to be situated to the south of it.¹²⁸ All the *tīrthas* are said to enter into the water of this *tīrtha* in the morning of the twelfth day of the second half of the month when the Sun is in the *dhanū rāśi*.¹²⁹ Mr. Dey locates it in Tirupati¹³⁰ in Andhra Pradesh.

Suvarṇamukharī : It is a holy river on *Veṅkaṭādri*.

Trikūṭa : The name occurs in association with the names of the mountains which are called *līṅga-parvatas*.¹³¹ It is said to be the son of *sumeru* mountain. Kālidāsa also refers to it which seems to be the *tirahnu* or *triraśmi* hill at Nāsik.¹³²

Vaikuṇṭha śaila : It is a cave where *svāmipuṣkarinī* exists. Several rivers like *suvarṇamukharī* etc., come across this cave.¹³³ It is one of the sub-*tīrthas* of *veṅkaṭācala*. Mr. Dey mentions one *baikanṭha* as a place of pilgrimage about twenty-two miles to the east of Tinnevely visited by Caitanya.¹³⁴

124. Sk. Ava. Reva. 6. 26-28.

125. Sk. Ma. Ke. 31. 92-94.

126. Hist. Dhs. IV. 807.

127. Sk. Vai. Veñ. M. 13. 49-50.

128. *ibid.* 17. 25.

129. *ibid.* 27. 21.

130. Geog. Dic. 199.

131. Sk. Ma. Ke. 31. 92-94.

132. Hist. Dhs. IV. 813.

133. Sk. Vai. Veñ. M. 38. 49-53.

134. Geog. Dic. 16.

Vāyuvāhini : It is mentioned as one of the different names of *narmadā*. It is said that as it takes the creatures to heaven it is called *vāyuvāhini* ¹³⁵

Veñānadi : Mr. Dey identifies it with the river waingāṅgā in the Central Provinces.¹³⁶

Veñā-Suvarṇamukhari-saṅgama : The confluence of the great river *veñā* and the *suvarṇamukhari* begins at the place sixteen miles north-east to the *tirthatraya*¹³⁷ being combined with this river. The river *suvarṇamukhari* runs through the mountainous area to the north. Then she flows through the second stage i.e., on the land for thirty-two miles. Then she enters into the country and flows to the east. Thereafter it flows to the north, in this country covering the area of twelve miles. *Vyāghrapada* is also said to be touched by this river.

Veṅkaṭācala : It is a place of pilgrimage in Southern India. It is so sacred that it covers a special chapter in the *Vaiṣṇavakhaṇḍa* known as *Veṅkaṭācala māhātmya*, containing forty subchapters. This chapter deals with the sub-tīrthas under and praises of the *veṅkaṭācala*. It is also known as *veṅkaṭādri* or *veṅkaṭa mahāśaila*. It is said to be situated four miles north to the *kamalākhyā sarovara*,¹³⁸ which is located on the north bank of the sacred river *suvarṇamukhari* by name. It is spread over fifty-six miles having the altitude of eight miles. Its peak is said to be a golden one. It is said to be the abode of God Viṣṇu. *Śeṣagiri* is probably the peak of this mountain, where exists the famous reservoir known as *svāmipuṣkarinī*. It is situated to the north of Śrīnivāsa and it is said to be very auspicious.¹³⁹ The God Veṅkaṭeśa stands here, a visit to which has been highly eulogised. Those who do not visit this temple have been condemned extremely.¹⁴⁰

Innumerable rivers, reservoirs, forests, *kṣetras*, *vedāranyas*, sages like Vaśiṣṭha and others, God Viṣṇu with Lakṣmī, God Śiva with Pārvatī, Sarasvatī and Sāvitrī, all the planets, Aṣṭa Vasus, Lokapālas and several other deities are said to reside here on the Veṅkaṭācala for all the twenty-four hours.¹⁴¹ Dr. Kane¹⁴² also refers to it and says that it is a mountain in Drāviḍa country, Arcot district, near Tirupati. He opines that

135. Sk. Ava. Reva. 6. 43-45.

136. Geog. Dic. 128.

137. Sk. Vai. Veñ. M.19. 1-3.

138. ibid. 1. 43-47.

139. ibid. 11. 86-88.

140. ibid. 18. 42-43.

141. ibid. 19. 1-18.

142. Hist. Dhs. IV. 820.

the shrine was once considered so holy that till 1870 no Christians or Muslims were allowed to ascend the hill Tirumala. According to the *Skānda purāṇa* there are sixty-six crores of *tīrthas* on this mountain,¹⁴³ among them sixty-eight hundred are givers of *bhakti* and *vairāgya*. Eventually it is recorded that there is no *tīrtha* at all in the world, and even those the *svāmipuṣkarinī* is more sacred.¹⁴⁴ It is said that in *satyayuga* at the request of Vṛṣabhāsura, it was named as *vṛṣabhācala*, in *tretā* it was known as *añjarācala* as Añjanā, the mother of Hanumān practised penance here. In the memory of the remaining part it was known as *śeṣācala* in *dvāpara*, and in the *kaliyuga* it is known as *veṅkaṭācala* as it removes all sins.¹⁴⁵ Lord Veṅk. ṭeśa or Veṅkaṭeśvara is situated on this mountain.

Vidaśā : It is one of the fifteen rivers that rise from the *ṛkṣapāda*, mountain. No detail is found in the *Skānda purāṇa*.¹⁴⁶ It may be identical with the river *bidiśā* which has been identified with the river Bes or Br̥sali which falls into the Betwa at Besnagar or Bhilsa.¹⁴⁷

Vimalā : It seems to be another name of the *narmadā* according to the *Skānda purāṇa*.¹⁴⁸

Vipāpā : It is said that as the river *narmadā* removes the sins it is called *vipāpā* also.¹⁴⁹

Vipāśā : As all the troubles are caught and not released by the *narmadā*, it is called *vipāśā*¹⁵⁰ 'vi' - means *vigata* and *pāśā* means bonds) Mr. Dey refers to *Bipāśā*¹⁵¹ and identifies it with the modern Bias, in the Punjab. As to its origin it is said that once the sage Vasiṣṭha was extremely sorry due to the death of his sons killed by Viśvāmitra. Consequently he tied his hands and feet and jumped into the river, but the river being afraid of a brahmin-murder unfastened his bondage through the strong current and saved him by throwing him on the banks.¹⁵²

Vṛṣabhācala or *Vṛṣādri* : It is situated on the west bank of *svāmipuṣkarinī tīrtha*.¹⁵³ The *Tirthāṅka* identifies it with the modern *Tirumālī-*

143. Sk. Var. Veṅ. M. 27. 5-7.

144. ibid. 40. 7.

145. Tīrth. 508.

146. Sk. Ava. Reva. 4. 45-49.

147. Geog. Dic. 35.

148. Sk. Ava. Reva. 6. 41-42.

149. ibid. Verse 39.

150. ibid. 6. 40.

151. Geog. Dic. 38.

152. Mbh. Ādi. ch. 179.

153. Sk. Vai. Veṅ. M. 1. 95-96.

ruṇicōlai.¹⁵⁴ According to the *Tīrthāṅka* it is an old *kṣetra* twelve miles north to Madura. Locally it is known as "*alaghar-koil*". Yamadharmarāja is said to have observed penance for Mahāviṣṇu in the form of a bull and the God was pleased with him. Since then it was called *vṛṣabhādri*. Vide *veṅkaṭācala* also.

Vyāghrapada : It is a river which is associated with the confluence of *veṇā* and *suvarṇamukharī*.¹⁵⁵ The famous *tīrtha* known as *śaṅkhatīrtha* is said to be situated on the bank of this river.

154. *Tīrthāṅka*, page 386.

155. *Sk. Vai. Veṇ. M.* 34. 37-42.

KĀKATĀLIYA - A GRAMMATICAL ANALYSIS BY BHARTṚHARI

The Sanskrit word *kākatāliya* is used to indicate a sudden and unexpected coincidence,¹ whether welcome or unwelcome.² Rhetoricians like Appayyadīkṣita and Jagannāthapaṇḍita cite the word as an example of *luptopamā*.³ It is derived from the rule *samāsāc ca tadviṣayāt* (*Pāṇini sūtra* 5. 3, 106) which says that the suffix *cha* is added to a compound having 'that' (i.e., *iva*) as its sphere. Bhoja makes his *sūtra* more explicit by adding the word *ākasmike* to it.⁴ The word is quite famous in Sanskrit literature and has been taken up by Bhartṛhari for explaining the *sūtra* 5. 3. 106.⁵

Patañjali has raised the question regarding the interpretation of the word *tad* in the rule 5. 3. 106. Surely a pronoun must point at that

1. (a) For the interpretation and various illustrations, see V.S. Apte: Sanskrit-English Dictionary, vol. 3, App. E, Poona 1959; G.A. Jacob: A Handful of Popular Maxims, Bombay, 1925.
(b) *atarkitopanatatvaṃ citṛikaraṇam ucyate kāśikā* (K) 5. 3. 74. p. 313, Prachya Bharati Series-5, Varanasi, 1967.
2. *upameyavācakatatpadasamabhivyāhāreṇa kadācit kākamarāṇe kadācit kṛtopabhoge lakṣaṇā*.
Nāgeśa's *Uddyota* (NU) on *Mahābhāṣya* (MB) 5. 3. 106, p. 404, Nirṇaya Sagar Press, Bombay.
3. *upamānamātravācākābhāvāc cedṛṣe viṣaye upamānalopavyavahāra ālaṅkārikāṇām*, NU, ibid.
See also, *Kuvalayānanda* of Appayyadīkṣita (Kuv.), pp. 7-9. Nirṇaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1947; *Rasagāṅgādhara* (R.G.), p. 242, Chowkhamba, 1955.
4. *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharāṇa* (SKA) 5. 3. 141, pt. 4, Trivendrum Sanskrit Series, 154, Trivendrum, 1948.
5. *kākatāliyam ity atra prasiddham hyupalakṣaṇam, Vākyapadīya* (VP). 3 *Vṛttisamuddeśa* (Vṛ). 606. University of Travancore Sanskrit Series 148, Trivendrum, 1942.

which is primary.⁶ The compound, here, is secondary since it forms a base for the addition of the suffix. The sense of *iva* too, which runs from the sūtra *ive pratikṛtau* (5. 3. 96), is secondary towards the addition of *cha*. So the answer is: By the word *tad*, *cha* is meant. But this is incorrect since *cha* is yet to be added, and before it is added, how can the compound be called as being conditioned by it?⁷

One might say that the expression *chaviṣayāt* is correct with reference to the future state of the complex formation. It means that *cha* is added to a compound which is not formed except where *cha* is added. But even then, it is not clear as to which compound *cha* is to be added. Whether it is to be added to the compounds like *rājās'a* (kinglike horse), or some other word, is yet undecided. And before it is added, a word could not get the compound-designation. A suffix which is already established, may qualify the base in a different operation, as, for instance, in the sūtra 5.3.30, where the suffix *atasuc* having been already added by the rule 5. 3. 28, is taken as a condition for the application of sixth case-affix. But so long as the suffix has not established itself, it cannot function as a qualifier to its own base.⁸

If so, then the *iva*-sense though secondary, must be understood by the word *tad*. But when the *iva*-sense has already been conveyed by the compound, the addition of *cha* in the sense of *iva* would be superfluous. If it be said that the suffix must be added because it has been enjoined by a rule (*vacanasāmarthyā*), then it could be added even to such compounds as *śāstrīśyāmā* because the sense of *iva* is there.⁹

Therefore Bhartṛhari says that the meaning in such cases is conditioned by two *iva* - senses. The stem (i.e., the compound) is con-

-
6. (a) *tad ity anena kim pratinirdiśyate, chaḥ*, MB. 5. 3. 106, p. 404.
 (b) *chasya vidheyatayā prādhānyena tasyaiva parāmarśo yukta ity abhimānaḥ*, NU. *ibid*.
7. *chāpekṣā tadviṣayatā vidheyatsān na gamyate*. VP. 3. Vṛ. 606.
8. (a) *rājāśvādīś cha viṣayaḥ syād anyo vety anīścitam | tena chasya vidhānāt prāg vyapadeśo na vidyate ||* *ibid* 607.
 (b) *tadviṣayād ity anena chaviṣayaḥ samāso 'viśeṣenopādīyamānaḥ sarvo rājāśvādīḥ prasiddho vidhāsyamānaḥ chaprakṛtītvād eva chaviṣayo 'nyo vā prakārantareṇa sambhāvya mānaś chaviṣayo gṛhyetety etāvan nā vadhāritam itthaṅca sarvasyaiva samāsasya prakṛtīvopapattau kim anena viśeṣaṇena vyavacchidyeta na tu svayam alabdhātmalābhāḥ svanimitasyaiva viśeṣaṇam yuktam, Helārāja's Prakīrṇaprakāśa* (HP), *ibid*. p. 264.
9. (a) *atha vacanād abhihite 'pivārthe pratyayo tadā śāstrīśyāmāder api samāsād ivārthābhīdhāyakāc chapratyayaḥ syāt*, *ibid*. p. 265.
 (b) *vacanasāmarthyād iti ced śāstrīśyāmādhībhyo 'tiprasaṅgaḥ*, Kaiyaṭa's *Pradīpa* (KP), 5. 3. 106, p. 265.

nected with one and the suffix with the other.¹⁰ The meaning is caused by both the *iva* – senses in a combination, each of them qualifying the other. This excludes the compounds like *śastrīśyāmā* or *rājāśva* etc., for two reasons. In *śastrīśyāmā devadattā* (knife-black Devadattā) the *upameya*, i.e., Devadattā, is not included in the sense of the compound. So just as Devadattā is compared with *śāstrī* (knife) which is famous for its black quality, somebody else also may be compared. So the *upameya* Devadattā cannot again function as an *upamāna* as far as blackness is concerned. So it does not condition the *upamāna*. For instance, if we want to compare the blackness of Yajñadattā with something else, we need not say *śastrīśyāmā (devadattā) iva yajñadattā*, because as far as blackness is concerned, *śāstrī* itself is a suitable *upamāna* and the use of Devadattā is superfluous.¹¹ But in *kākatāliya*, the *upamāna kākatāla* itself functions as an *upameya* and it becomes an *upamāna* towards a second *upameya*, namely, killing etc. That's why two *iva* – senses are explained here. Thus the *Kāśikā* *ṛiti* says that the suffix *cha* is added in a second *iva*-sense to a compound which has *iva* as its sphere.¹² In the second place, in *śastrīśyāmā* etc., only one member of the compound is conditioned by the *iva* – sense, while in *kākatāliya* the compound-whole is qualified by *iva*-sense.¹³

What are the two *iva* – senses referred to above? They have been explained by Patañjali and Bhartṛhari. In *Kākatāliya*, the word *kāka* (crow) denotes the arrival of crow and *tāla* (palm-nut) denotes the fall of the palm-nut. The arrival of the crow stands for the arrival of somebody else, Caitra, for instance. The fall of the palm-nut stands for the assault by the bandits. The common property here is the unexpected incident. This comparison is expressed by the compound. At their

10. *dvayor ivārthayor arthanimittatvam pratīyate |
ekenāvayavo yuktaḥ pratīyao 'nyena yujyate ||*
VP. 3. Vṛ. 608.
11. (a) *śastrīśyāmety atra punaḥ prasiddhaśyāmaguṇayā yathā śāstryā devadattā
upamīyate, tathā 'nyāpti devadattā – khyenopamānasyāprayojanaivād eka
ivārthaḥ*, HP. *ibid*.
(b) *yady api śāstryupamita devadattasyānyatropamānatvaṃ vaktum śakyam tatra
yadi śyāmatvenaiva sādṛśyam tarhi śastrīśyāma-padaḥ prayogenaiva siddhau
ītaravaiyarthyaṃ, dhurmāntareṇa tu sādṛśyam na pratīyate iti bhāṣaḥ*, NU.
5. 3. 106, p. 434.
12. *ivārthaviśayāt samāsād aparasmīn ivārthe eva chaḥ pratīyao bhavati*,
K. 5. 3. 106, p. 313.
13. (a) *na hy atra samāsa ivārthe vartate. kim tarhi? pūrvapadam uttarapadam
vā śāstrīva śyāmā, 'puruṣo 'yam vyūghra iveri*, Nyāsa on K: *ibid*
(b) *kim ca tadviśayād ity asyevārthaviśayāt sarvāyavakād ity arthaḥ. śāstrī-
śyāmetyādau pūrvapadam evārthaviśayam iti na doṣaḥ*, NU. 5. 3. 106, p. 404.

meeting, an action like killing or enjoying¹⁴ naturally comes to our mind.¹⁵ When we want to compare with it something, then the suffix *cha* is intended to be added to denote an *upameya* like the killing of Caitra etc.¹⁶ Thus the compound itself denotes the whole process of comparison.

The idea of two *iva*-senses is not agreeable to Nārāyaṇadaṇḍa-nātha.¹⁷ According to him, the suffix *cha* merely reveals the *iva* sense inherent in the compound. The reason behind this seems to be that *cha* is a *svārtika* suffix. But Patañjali has already said that there is no sense in adding *cha* in the sense of *iva*, which is already expressed by the compound.¹⁸ The later writers have generally followed the analysis given by Patañjali and Bhartṛhari.¹⁹

14. cf. *yattayā melanaṃ tatra lābho me yaś ca tadrataḥ | tadetat kākātāliyaṃ avitarkitasambhavam || ubhayatropameyaṃ svasya kvacidgamaṇaṃ tatraiva rahasi tanvyā avasthānaṃ ca. tena svasya tasyāś ca samāgamaḥ kākātālasamāgamasadrśaḥ iti phalaṭitathā ca patanadalitaṃ tālaphalaṃ yathā kakenopabhuktaṃ, evaṃ raho darśanakṣubhita hrdayā tanvīsvenopabhuktaṃ iti tadarthaḥ*, Kuv. pp. 7-8
15. *samāgamasya tādṛśakriyādyayābhinnatvenoktayuktīyā tasyoktārtha eva paryavasānaṃ*, *Alīnakaracandrikā* on Kuv. p. 9.
16. (a) *caitrasya tatrāgamaṇaṃ kākasyāgamaṇaṃ yathā | dasyor abhinipātas tu tālasya patanaṃ yathā || samnipāte tayor yān yā kriyā tatropa jāyate | vadhādir upame ye'rthe tayā chavidhir iṣyate |* VP. 3. Vṛ. 609-610.
cf. *kākāgamaṇaṃ iva kākātālaṃ, kākātālaṃ iva kākātāliyaṃ*, MB. 5.3. 106, p. 404.
- (b) "The *upamāna* is obtained from *kākātāla*, namely, *tālena yathā kākasya vadhah* : 'just like killing of the crow takes place by the palm-nut.' The *upameya* is obtained from *kākātāliyaṃ*, namely, *dasyunā tathā caitrasya vadhah* : 'so also killing of Caitra takes place by a bandit.' The *upamāna* action is incomplete, unless we shown an *upameya* action. This latter is indicated by *cha*." S.D. Joshi, *Vyākaraṇa Mahābhāṣya*. *Avyayībhāvatat-puruṣāhnikā* (ATA), f.n. 253; Publications of the CA3S, Class C, no. 5, Poona, 1969.
17. *tad ity anena ivārthaviśayas taddhito nirdiśyate tadviśayo yaḥ samāsaḥ 'kākātālodaya ivārthe' (3.2. 5) iti vihitas tasmād ivārthe dyotye ākasmikaviśaye chapratyayo bhavati.....anye tv ivārthaviśayaṭ samāsād aparasminn ivārthe pratyayaṃ icchanti* *Hṛdayahārīṇī* comm. on SKAV. 3. 141, p. 110.
18. *yadi tarhi samāso 'pīvārthe pratyayo 'pi, samāsenoktatvāt pratyayo na prāpnoti*, MB. 5.3. 106, p. 404.
19. cf. *kākasyāgamaṇaṃ yādṛcchikaṃ, tālasya patanaṃ ca, tena tālena patatā kākasya vadhah kṛtaḥ, evaṃ eva devadattasya tatrāgamaṇaṃ, dasyūnāṃ copanipātaḥ, taśca tasya vadhah kṛtaḥ. tatra yo devadattasyadasyūnāṃ ca samāgamaḥ, sa kākātālasamāgamasadrśa ity eka upamārthaḥ. ataś ca devadattasya vadhah, sa kākātālasamāgamasadrśa iti dvitīya upamārthaḥ. tatra prathamō samāsaḥ, dvitīyo pratyayaḥ*, K. 5.3. 106, pp. 313-314.
cf. also KP, MB. 5.3. 106, p. 404, *Siddhānta-kaumudī*.

But there, in the compound *kākatāla*, the two constituents *kāka* and *tāla* have no connection between themselves. Unless a connection is established the compounding cannot take place in the absence of *sāmar-thya* : 'semantic connection'. For, without being mutually connected, they cannot convey an integrated meaning. Bhartṛhari replies to this objection by saying that the substantive word here denotes the action associated with it. So the words *kāka* and *tāla* denote the arrival of the crow and fall of the palm-nut respectively.²⁰ This associated action is understood from the integration (*vṛtti*). Elsewhere also, it is seen in this way, as, for instance, in *dadhyodanaḥ*, *guḍadhānāḥ* etc.²¹

But even when the actions have been thus understood, what relation do they bring between the two constituents. Helārāja says that the action being understood in this way, the two words function as *upamānas* of each other. The fall of the palm-nut is unexpected like the arrival of the crow and the arrival of crow is unexpected like the fall of the palm-nut. Thus the two being *upamānas* towards each other, connection between them is established and the compound becomes possible.²²

But, it is not intelligible how the words *kāka* and *tāla* function as *upamānas* of each other when at the same time they stand as the *upamānas* for the arrival of Caitra and the assault by the bandits. Nāgeśa, however, puts it in a different manner. In his *Uddyota* he says that the words *kāka* and *tāla* denote, by implication, *kākāgamanasādṛśa* (like the arrival of the crow) and *tālapatanasādṛśa* (like the fall of the palm-nut) and the two are connected because of the *sāmānādhikarāṇya* relation.²³ Probably he assumes *lakṣaṇā* here, under the influence of rhetoricians. Earlier, Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha has also said that the words *kāka* and *tāla* denote, by *lakṣaṇā* the arrival of the crow and the fall of the palm-nut.²⁴ In his *Bṛhacchabdenduśekhara*, however,

20. *kṛiyāyūṃ samavetāyūṃ dravyaśabdo 'vatiṣṭhate |
pāṭīgamanayoh kākātālaśabdau tathā sthītau ||* VP. 3. Vṛ. 611.

21. P. 2. 1. 34. 35, Vt. 7 and 8; also S.D. Joshi, ATA, intro pp. xxii-xxiv.

22. *tataś cāyam atrārthaḥ - kākāgamanam ivātarkitopasamprāptau idaṃ tālapa-
tanam tālapatanam iva cātarkitopasamprāptam idaṃ kākāgomanam iti paraspara-
pānānena pūrvottarapadārthayoh samanyayopapattau pratyayārthaviśeṣaṇato-
papatih.* H P. 3 Vṛ. 611, p. 266.

23. *atra pūrvottarapadayoh kākāgamanasādṛśatālapatanasādṛśayor lakṣaṇā,
sāmānādhikarāṇyena ca tadarthayor anvayaḥ,* NU 5.3. 106 p. 404.

24. *atra kākātālaśabdayor lakṣaṇayā kākāgamanatālapatanabodhakayor ivārthe
'samāsūc ca tadviśayāt' iti jñāpakāt samāse kāka iva tāla iva kākātālom iti
kākātālasamāgamasādṛśaś corāṇām asya ca samāgama ity arthaḥ,* RG. 2, p. 242.

Nāgeśa says that this meaning is the outcome of the integration.²⁵ Nāgeśa's explanation appears more convincing and is in conformity with the analytical sentence *kākāgamanamiva tālapatanamiva kākātālam*, given by Patañjali.

But why, in the very beginning, the killing of Caitra by the bandits is not compared to the killing of the crow by palm-nut? This comparison only, is finally intended. What is the need of postulating the combinations of *kāka* and *tāla* through the secondary formations of *kākāgamana* and *tālapatana*? Bhartṛhari says that such an analysis is assumed only for grammatical explanation. The sentence in actual usage is never found in this manner.²⁶ The whole process of comparison which is inherent in the compound itself is explained by assuming an *iva*-sense in the compound.²⁷ Under *kārikā* 607, Helārāja says that the one *iva*-sense has two different functions here. In the compound it shows that the constituents *kāka* and *tāla* which express the *upamānas*, themselves function as *upmēyas*.²⁸ In the suffix it serves to reveal a comparison between the killing of the crow and that of Caitra.²⁹ But the same meaning cannot have two different functions according to the maxim '*śabdabuddhikarmanām viramya vyāpārābhāvaḥ*'. That's why the two *iva*-senses have been postulated. This is only a means to analyse the word into the base and suffix which is the main function of grammar.³⁰ The commentary *Alaṃkāracandrikā* on Kuv. says that there are the peculiar ways of explaining the derivational process invented by the science of grammar on the basis of experience.³¹

25. *tatra pūrvapadaṃ kākāgamasadrśaparam, uttarapadaṃ ca kākāgamanasamānādhikaraṇatālapatanasadrśaparam. tayoḥ ca sāmānādhikaraṇyaṃ sambandhaḥ. kākāgamanasadrśasamānādhikaraṇam. kākāgamanasamānādhikaraṇatālapatanasadrśam iti samāsārthah. ekārthibhāva balacca vṛttāv etadarthalābhah. etena pūrvottarapadārthayoḥ asāmarthyāt samāso durlabha ity apāstam,*

Bṛhacchabdenduṣekhara, vol. 2, p. 1525, Varanasi 1960.

26. *yad anvākyāyakam vākyaṃ tad evaṃ parikalpyate | prayogavākyaṃ yal loke tad evaṃ na prayujyate ||* VP. 3. Vṛ. 612.

27. *vīṣiṣṭopamāyām viśeṣaṇopamāgativat samāga mopamāyām api tadavayavakriyayor yathā yogaṃ gamyamānām upamām abhipretya mahābhāṣyakṛtā tādṛśa-vigrahapraṇayanam ity āśayaḥ, Alaṃkāracandrikā* on Kuv. p. 9.

28. cf. *upamānaśabdasyaiva opameyavṛttivād* — — —, KP. 2.1.3.

29. *sarvanāmapratyavamarśasāmarthyād ivārthasyātra dvaḥ vyāpārau sampadyete. tenaikena vyāpāreṇ evārthah samāsasyā vacchedako 'pareṇa pratyayavācya jāyate*, HP. 3. Vṛ. 607, p. 264.

30. *iha prakṛtīpratyayavibhāgavaśeṇānvākyānam iti prakriyāvākyaṃ anena prakāreṇa samanvītārthapadaṃ sampadyate*, HP. ibid. 612, p. 266.

31. *na ca sakṛduccārītābhyām kākātālapadābhyām katham upamāna dvayāvagama iti vācyam. anubhāvānusāryānuśāsanena vyutpattivaicitryasya sphuṭam pratipattir iti. kuv. p. 8.*

The compound *kākatāla* is never used as a separate word in the sentence. It always occurs as a bound form with *cha*. Perhaps for this reason Pāṇini does not make a separate rule for the formation of this compound. It is formed by this very rule.³² Bhoja makes a separate rule for the formation of the compound *kākatāla*,³³ but this is not proper because the compound is never used independently.

The *iva*-sense in the compound is assumed for explaining the unexpected coincidence, e.g., arrival of the crow and the fall of the palm-nut. The words *kāka* and *tāla* cannot explain it by themselves. This sense comes out from the integration. This has been further explained by Bhartṛhari.

The integration (viz., the addition of *cha*) is taught from the compound-stem in the sense of those two whose meeting appears like that of the crow and the palm-nut. In the sense of another *upameya cha* is intended to be employed, when that whose killing by a bandit, like that of the crow by the palm-nut, is intended to be expressed in a picturesque form. Similarly something else which takes place in the wake of something unexpectedly and is surprising is indicated by the word *kākatālīya*.³⁴

Other examples of this type are *ajākrpāṇīyam*, *andhakavartikīyam*, *khalatibulvīyam* etc. A word *raghukautsīyam* has been coined by Bhaṭṭa Devaśiṅkarapurohita (A.D. 1765) on the analogy of the word *kākatālīya*. This is based on Raghu's suddenly meeting Kautsa and his extreme liberality with which Kautsa was benefitted.³⁵

32. (i) *atrāpi yenai āvayavakāryam pratyayotpattiḥ kriyate tenaiva samudāyākāryam samāsa samjñā bhaviṣyati,* M.B. 2. 1. 3.

(b) *ivārthe kākatālādyaḥ samāsa syur amī iti | jñāyate tena yogena pratyayaś ca vidhīyate ||*

Prakriyākauṇḍī – Prasāda, p. 937, ed. by K.P. Trivedi, Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series 28, 1925.

33. *Kākatālādaya ivārthe*. SKA. 3. 2. 5.

34. (a) *yayor atarkitā prāptir drśyate kākatālavat | tayor samāsaprakṛter vṛttir abhyupagamyate || kākasya tālena yathā vadho yasya tu dasyunā | tatra citrīkṛte 'nyasminn upameye cha iṣyate , |* VP. 3. Vṛtti. 613-614.

(b) *yathā tālena kāko yadṛcchayā hatas tathā yad aparam asamīhitam āścaryabhūtam jāyate, tat kākatālīyam ucyate* HP. ibid. 614.

35. *saṅgo rāghavaśhūpena dhanatābho 'titheś ca yaḥ | tad etad raghukautsīyam amṛtānandadam nṛṇām || atra raghukautsīyam ity asya kākatālīyam, ajākrpāṇīyam ity ādivan niṣpattiḥ Aṭṭakāramañjūṣā*, p. 8, ed. by Śaḍashiva Lakshmidhara Katre, *Scindia Oriental Series* 1, Ujjain, 1940.

Prof. V. PERUMAL

THE TAMIL SOCIETY OF THE SAṅGAM AGE

1. Introduction

It is an acknowledged fact that the Tamil society is noted for its high antiquity. The historical, linguistic, archeological, literary, numismatic and other evidences corroborate beyond a shadow of doubt the high antiquity of the Tamil society and its many-sided excellence. The very fact that there are 260 references (16% of the total aphorisms) to ancient literatures in *Tolkāppiam*, confirms in an unambiguous language the existence of great literary treatises on various branches of knowledge. Unfortunately all these literatures have been lost. The ancient Tamil literature known as the Saṅgam literature consists of *Tolkāppiam* (grammar), *Pattuppāṭṭu* (ten idylls) *Eṭṭutogai* (eight anthologies), *Tirukkural* (ethics), *Śilappatikāram* and *Maṇimekalai* (twin epics). On the basis of the various relevant evidences available, the Saṅgam literature can be assigned to the period ranging from 500 B.C. to A.D. 200. This period is generally known as the Saṅgam Age as the Tamil Saṅgam (academy) which was patronised by the Pāṇḍyan kings at Madurai has played a very significant role in the literary and cultural fields of Tamilnadu. The saṅgam literature besides throwing an appreciable flood of light on different branches of knowledge reflects each and every aspect of the Tamil society. The ancient Tamilians distinguished themselves in various healthy activities and led a very useful life of a high order. A deep analysis of the Saṅgam literature and other relevant sources and records reveals the fact that the ancient Tamil society was in a very advance state of culture. It was a society of well-balanced development in titanic proportions. The great encomiums paid to ancient Tamilnadu by foreign personalities are not hyperbolic in character but naked truths. An attempt is made in this paper to study analytically the Tamil society of the Saṅgam Age.

2. Literature

The *Tolkāppiam* is not only a grammar in the ordinary sense of the term but a great treatise which deals with almost all the aspects of human activity. Tolkāppiar has clarified each and every point with logical precision and aphoristic brevity. For instance, he points out that one can legitimately feel proud owing to four reasons namely, learning, valour, fame and charity. The *Tolkāppiam* is the grammatical and literary charter, serving as a beacon light throughout the ages of literary history of Tamilnadu. The *Pattuppāṭṭu* describes every aspect of the Tamil society in a picturesque language. The eight anthologies (*Eṭṭutogai*) were compiled and classified on the basis of metre, length and subject matter. It is needless to mention that the classification was done in an apple-pie order according to the principles of logical division. Among the eight anthologies *Naṭṟinai*, *Kuruntogai*, *Aiṅkurumūru*, *Kalittogai* and *Aganāṇūru* are amatory poetry. *Puranānūru* mainly deals with warfare, state craft, charity and ethics. *Paṭiṭṭruppāṭṭu* gives an account of the Cera kings and throws a light in fixing the chronological position of the ancient Cera monarchs. *Paripāḍal* is a miscellany which deals with love, religion and nature. Tiruvaḷḷuvar has given the quintessence of advanced wisdom in his immortal ethics, *Tirukkuraḷ*. *Śilappatikāram*, a dramatic epic (tragedy) and *Maṇimekalai*, a religious epic are treated as twin epics. The former has a great appeal as "our sweetest songs are those which tell of saddest thought" (Shelley). The Saṅgam literature is a mirror which reflects all the aspects of the ancient Tamil society. The Saṅgam poets, who were about 500 in number, touched every branch of knowledge. Beauty of expression, clarity of thought, brevity in diction, intelligibility of theme, sublimity of idea, nobility in purpose, effectiveness of appeal, catholicity of character and universality of outlook are the special characteristics of Saṅgam literature. It is almost free from Sanskrit words, hybrid style, pedantic phrase and fantastic imagination. The Saṅgam poets sincerely considered Nature as their teacher. They received inspiration from Nature and described her beauty in a mellifluous language with aesthetic excellence.

3. Education

From time immemorial education is considered to be the infallible wealth. The very fact that Tiruvaḷḷuvar, who was very brief in his treatment, has allotted many chapters dealing with various aspects of education, corroborates the sublime values of education. Tiruvaḷḷuvar has divided the entire faculties into two main divisions namely, arts and sciences. Mathematics – the queen of sciences, and letters – the basis of arts the two faculties pointed out by Tiruvaḷḷuvar. He has indicated in an unerring language the universality of education. In other words, mathematics and letters are the two eyes for each and every human being under the sun.

The learned author has indicated briefly but very clearly the various aims of education. Knowledge aim,¹ social aim,² moral aim,³ philosophical aim,⁴ spiritual aim,⁵ cultural aim⁶ and living aim⁷ are some of the important aims of education dealt with in the *Tirukkural*. According to Tiruvaḷḷuvar, teaching has four stages namely, feeling the pulse of the students, grasping the subject to be taught, simplifying the subject and appealing and inspiring presentation⁸. To all intents and purposes an uneducated man is not better than animal⁹. Tolkāppiar mentions general education and technical education in one of the aphorisms of his *Tolkāppiam*.¹⁰

Pāṇḍyan Neduñcezian, the king-poet, gives a vivid pen portrait of the glory of learning. He says that an educated man, however low may be his social position, will be respected even by the ruler of the land.¹¹ The poets of the Saṅgam Age have educated the kings as well as the ordinary people. They gave the rulers sound advice on various matters at appropriate occasions and played a remarkable role in the educational field of ancient Tamilnadu. Teaching was considered as the noblest and the most respectable profession. In short, the ancient Tamils did not consider education as a means to earn bread and butter but realized that it was for life, through life and throughout life.

4. Society

Society consists of men, women and children. According to Tamil the word 'man' has various shades of meaning. Though generally it refers to the masculine gender among human beings it specially connotes a person who has the power of control. Spiritually speaking man is expected to control his senses and attain spiritual mastery. The term 'woman' apart from its primary meaning, has a special connotation. The word *per*, which means woman has derived from the root 'perpu' signifying 'love', 'desire' etc. The implication is, woman is a

-
1. Kuraḷ. 396.
 2. *ibid.* 140.
 3. *ibid.* 134.
 4. *ibid.* 354.
 5. *ibid.* 2.
 6. *ibid.* 997.
 7. *ibid.* 391.
 8. *ibid.* 424, 711.
 9. *ibid.* 410.
 10. Tolkāppiam, Poruḷatikāram (Kazagam Edition, June 1953). Agattiṇaiyal aphorism No. 44.
 11. Puraṇānūru 183.

possessor of all the amicable qualities, and hence she is lovable. Children are considered to be the wealth of the parents and a source of enjoyment.¹²

The ancient Tamil society was classified into many divisions. The divisions were made not to create any disparity or inequality among the people but to direct them to embrace different occupations for the smooth sailing of the society. As a matter of fact, the classification was made on the principle of division of labour. The ancient Tamils have realized and recognised the dignity of labour.

There was perfect social equality between man and woman. In certain respects woman was respected to a greater degree. A chaste woman was not only paid social respects but viewed with a deep sense of divine veneration. She was placed on a par with God. Kindness was considered as a fundamental social affinity and there was a perfect harmonious co-existence. Man without social culture was placed among the dead.¹³ 'Divine and consume' was the social ethics envisaged and actualised by the Tamils of the Saṅgam Age.¹⁴ The temples served the purpose of social institutions and people assembled and mixed with each other with perfect social liberty, equality and fraternity. The purpose of friendship is to help each other says Tiruvalluvar. Give and take policy was considered as one of the main social principles on which smooth social intercourse could be made. Unity in diversity and social catholicity are the special features of the Saṅgam Age.

5. *Matrimony*

Marriage was considered as a sacred rite of the union of two hearts. Matrimonial process had two stages namely, pre marital and post marital, and sanctity was maintained throughout the process. There was complete identification of husband and wife in their walk of life. The purpose of marriage is not only to enjoy sensual pleasure but also to do charity with a deep sense of fellow feeling.¹⁵ Woman was given the highest place in society in general and at home in particular. The Tamil word *illāl* (*il*+*āl*) which ordinarily means wife has a special connotation. The word can be split conveniently into two distinct units namely '*il*' and '*āl*' meaning thereby the ruler of the home. So, it is crystal clear that the wife was not only treated as a partner of the man but the ruler of the home and the better half in the real sense of the

12. Kuraḷ 61, 65, 66; puranāṇūru 188.

13. *ibid.* 214.

14. Puram 163.

15. Kuruntogai 63; Kuraḷ 81.

term. The love experienced by the married couple was not a lust of sensual craving but a tender feeling of a high order. Tiruvalluvar has rightly pointed out, that such a love is more tender than the flower.¹⁶ Various aspects of harmony between husband and wife were indicated by Tolkāppiar.

Monogamy was the only moral code accepted by the society.¹⁷ Though prostitution existed it was looked upon with contempt by every cultured Tamilian.¹⁸ The marriage functions celebrated during the earlier stage of the Saṅgam Age were practically free from Āryan influence.¹⁹ It will be noticed that in this ancient Tamil rite of marriage there is absolutely nothing Āryan, no lighting of fire, no circumambulation of fire and no priest to receive *dakṣiṇā*.²⁰ The Matrimonial union was very natural which was based on mutual understanding, mutual consent, mutual help and mutual love.

6. *Morality*

Morality was considered as the foundation stone on which the entire human virtues were based. Though the Saṅgam literatures (except Kuraḷ) are not ethical in character, they have moral view and have the force to inculcate moral sense among the readers. Morality is the right conduct in conformity with all virtues. As morality makes a man great, it is his duty to maintain a very high moral standard. Maintaining morality is more important than preserving life.²¹ Morality as envisaged by the Saṅgam poets has a deeper significance than it is generally understood. Even the thinking of evil thought was considered a serious moral offence. Morality is not only a code of behaviour but also a code of life. It is a virtue among virtues and embraces all the sublime ethical maxims. The sense of gratitude was considered as an essential quality that should be possessed by every cultured man on the globe and ingratitude was not only a mere immoral act but an unpardonable sin.²² The term morality which was defined logically and understood precisely by the ancient Tamil savants has a tripartite connotation namely purity of thought, word and deed. In short, according to the Saṅgam literature, morality is not only a view of life but a way of life.

16. Kuraḷ 1289.

17. *ibid.* 1315; Kuruntogai 49.

18. Puranānūru 73.

19. Aganānūru 86, 136.

20. See. P.T. Srinivasa Iyengar, *History of Tamils* p.30.

21. Kuraḷ 131.

22. *ibid.* 110; Puranānūru 34.

7. Religion

All the literary works of the Saṅgam Age declare in an unambiguous language that Tamilians had a strong faith in the existence of the Almighty. Though the Almighty was mentioned by different names and attributes, the ancient Tamils embraced monotheism. The Almighty was described as an embodiment of all the noble virtues.²³ Though there were many temples of deities, they believed that there is only one ultimate reality i.e., the all pervading God. This is corroborated by the fact that the Almighty was always mentioned in the singular. *Paripāḍal* gives a flash of light on temples. People congregated at temples in order to enjoy peace of mind and spiritual pleasure. They did NOT BEG, BUT PRAYED GOD. They did not pray God for loaves and fishes but for his divine grace.²⁴ Among the various religious rites that were in vogue, the practice of virgins taking bath in the early morning during the cold season in the month of *mārgazhi* (December-January) deserves special mention. It was popularly known as *tainirāḍal* and *ambāḍal*. It was a rigid course of spiritual discipline which enabled the virgins to attain a harmonious development of physical cleanliness, mental purity and spiritual sublimation.²⁵ The ancient Tamils believed in the cycle of birth and death and the result of *karma*.

Tirumurugāṭruppaḍai clarifies beyond a shadow of doubt that they had a divine mind coupled with aesthetic sense as a result of which they could feel in their heart of hearts spiritual awe and enjoy the sight of Cupid (Lord Murugan) in the scenic beauty of the hills and mountains. In such a natural and pleasant atmosphere which was far from the madding crowd, they could come nearer to God and have a harmonious spiritual communion. In short, the religion which was embraced by the ancient Tamils, whatever might be its name, was universal in appeal and rational in character.

8. Culture

The term culture has a deep connotation and wide denotation. Tamil culture has four stages touching four aspects namely, virtue-ethical, wealth-material, pleasure-emotional, and salvation-spiritual. Though there is difference of opinion regarding the order of the first three, all the Tamil savants are at one regarding the existence and necessity of the four stages. Some of the ancient poets have mentioned and enumerated only the first three, leaving the readers to understand the fourth namely, salvation by themselves. Whatever may be the order of the four stages, it is crystal clear that they are all closely connected

23. *ibid.* 9.

24. *Paripāḍal* 5:11; 78-81.

25. *ibid.* 11, 74-92; *Kalittogai* 59

10. *Military*

While enumerating the six state agencies, army was given the first place.³² It is a well-known truth that army alone can defend the country from foreign aggression, and maintain peace in the land and uphold the national prestige. Courage coupled with patriotism was the basic qualification of a soldier. Physical strength was considered as an additional qualification. It is an acknowledged psychological truth, where there is a will, there is a way. A keen perusal of the military science revealed in the Saṅgam literature discloses the fact that mental aptitude was given a higher priority than the physical fitness at the time of recruitment. Every effort was made to maintain the quality of the army. In other words, the army consisting of a few but the best men was preferred to that of the useless and huge mob. Such is the military secret that has been revealed by Tiruvaḷḷuvar³³ The mother always felt joyous and proud when she heard that her son fought the battle with martial spirit and valour.³⁴ The very expression *mūdin mullai* has a military connotation which refers to the valour of women. Though they did not go to the battle front, they had the military spirit sprung up from their patriotic sentiments. Brave mothers alone can produce brave soldiers. It was considered an unparadonable and serious disgrace to sustain injuries at the back. On the other hand, sustaining injuries at the chest, however fatal it might be, was considered a unique honour. The battle was fought during the broad daylight only by previous arrangement and mutual consent. The social feature of the military etiquette was that the soldiers of the opposing army who showed a clean pair of heels were not chased. It was considered a dishonour to chase or attack the run-away soldiers. The soldiers who fought and sacrificed their lives at the battle field were remembered with gratitude. Their statues were installed in their memory.³⁵

11. *Polity*

The Saṅgam Age witnessed monarchy. It was neither a tyrannical monarchy nor an ordinary one but a benevolent and welfare monarchy in the real sense of the term. Though the ancient Tamilnadu was a single nation culturally, there were three political entities namely, Cera, Coḷa and Pāṇḍya kingdoms. There were also many chieftains who ruled over small territories under the control of one or other of the three monarchs. The king was mentioned by several names among which the term *kāvalan* deserves a special analysis. It has two semantic units namely, *kā* (protect. defend) and *valan* (able person) mean-

32. Kuraḷ 381.

33. *ibid.* 763.

34. Puranānūru 278.

35. Aiṅkurunūru 352, Kuraḷ 771; Puranānūru 232, 260, 305, 329.

ing thereby able protector. Hence, a king was expected to protect his subjects and defend their faith, virtues, culture etc. Though the king was the unquestionable gubernatorial authority of the land, he consulted his council of ministers, poets and elder statesmen and took their advice on important issues. The very fact that Tiruvaḷḷuvar has devoted ten chapters (100 couplets) dealing with various important aspects of ministry, corroborates the vital role of the council of ministers in the government. The ancient Tamil kings ruled the land with the greatest amount of moral responsibility as evidenced from the words of Ceran Ceṅguṭṭuvan.³⁶ The prosperity and virtues of the land entirely depend upon the righteousness of the government. If a king does not govern properly the revenue will diminish and industries will deteriorate.³⁷ The two terms found in this couplet namely *apayan* and *aruthozhilar* have misinterpreted by Parimelazhagar. *Apayan* means source of revenue, *aruthozhilar* signifies people engaged in six occupations namely, agriculture, industries, painting, commerce, education and sculpture.

12. Economics

Wealth was considered as one of the four main entities realized by the ancient Tamils. At the individual level, every man worked hard to earn his daily bread and maintained his family. There are many instances where the husband or lover went to distant places to earn wealth leaving his better half at home. Man was expected to render service and work hard³⁸. Spending the ancestor's property was considered more shameful than begging.³⁹ The Coḷa, Pāṇḍya and Cera kings improved agriculture, pearl-fishery and forest wealth respectively and developed the national economy. They levied reasonable tax. They did not kill the goose that laid the golden eggs. They were fully aware of the fact that they could not increase the national exchequer by tax alone nor was it desirable. The only way to improve the national economy was to tap new sources and increase production in every field. Though many industries were in vogue the ancient Tamilnadu was based on agricultural economy.⁴⁰ Hence it can be said that agriculture is our ancient occupation which is capable of driving hunger and disease from the land. Tiruvaḷḷuvar has envisaged such a type of land.⁴¹ The economic principles realized by the Tamil savants were based on sound reason, which can stand the test of time. One should live within one's means⁴², wealth should be earned by righteous means⁴³, the purpose of

36. Śilappatikāram 25 : 100-104.

37. Kuraḷ 560.

38. Kuruntogai 135.

39. *ibid.* 283.

40. Kuraḷ 1032.

41. *ibid.* 734.

42. *ibid.* 478.

43. *ibid.* 755.

earning money is not to hoard but to distribute it for the welfare of the people⁴⁴ are some of the main economic principles stressed in Tamil literature. The ancient Tamil cities like Pugār, Madurai, etc., were the seats of fabulous wealth. Many poets embraced one occupation or other and maintained the dignity of labour. Idleness was viewed with contempt, and labour, whatever might be its nature, was looked upon with great respect. Inequality among various occupations was not felt. In short, the economic history of the ancient Tamils can be summed up thus:- They worked hard, earned well, spent usefully and enjoyed life.

13. Commerce

It is an acknowledged historical fact that ancient Tamilnadu had commercial intercourse with different countries of the world. Exports and imports of various commodities were in full swing. Kāverippūmpaṭṭinam was not only a great sea port of the Coḷa kingdom but also an international emporium with a cosmopolitan atmosphere.⁴⁵ The Cera country exported pepper to Greece and Rome by ship and in return she received bullions of gold. Muširi was a sea port of the Cera land, full of commercial activities.⁴⁶ Imayavaramban and Ceṅguṭṭuvan improved the foreign trade. Exchange of articles was the special feature in the field of trade and commerce. For instance paddy, (the produce of the arable land) and salt (of the littoral tract) were exchanged commercially.⁴⁷ The famous market at Madurai, the Pāṇḍyan capital, was planned so perfectly that every row was assigned to a particular category of commodity. There was a flag with a specific emblem indicating the articles sold in the shop. There were day markets and evening markets in Madurai where all the articles under the sun were sold. The merchants were given moral encouragement in their commercial enterprise by the kings. The successful merchants were honoured with the title *eṭṭi*. They enjoyed recognition from every section of the society. The speciality of the trade and commerce of ancient Tamilnadu was that each and every code of commercial ethics was respected in practical life. Perfect justice was maintained in every commercial transaction.⁴⁸ Tīruvaḷḷuvar has indicated precisely the inevitability of righteousness in the field of commerce.⁴⁹ In fine, commerce and trade flourished in such a handsome manner because they were

44. Puranānūru 189.

45. Paṭṭinappālai 11 : 213-218.

46. Aganānūru 149.

47. *ibid.* 140.

48. Paṭṭinappālai 11 : 206-212.

49. Kuraḷ 120.

based on perfect virtue and completely free from black-marketing, food adulteration and other malpractices. This was the only secret for the glorious success of the ancient Tamil merchants.

14. Industries

The ancient Tamilnadu witnessed various industries which determined the economic standard of the country. Small scale cottage industries flourished in every village. Various metal works, carpentry, weaving, tailoring, leather works, manufacture of variety of instruments characterised the industrial field of ancient Tamilnadu. Among these industries, weaving occupied the most outstanding position. In fact, weaving was second only to agriculture. The commentary in the *Śilappatikāram* throws a flood of light on 36 varieties of cloth manufactured in the Saṅgam Age.⁵⁰ A linguistic analysis of all the words referring to cloths will reveal the significant role of ancient textiles. For instance, *tunī*, *tunḍu*, *vēṭṭi*, *śēlai kōaḍi*, *puḍavai*, *tugil*, *kūrai*, *kaliṅgam*, *vuḍai*, *vuḍukkai*, *vuḍuppu*, *āḍai*, *meypai*, *caṭṭai*, *śilai*, *pāvāḍai*, *kācai*, *kācu*, *aṅgi*, *iravikkai*, *kōvanam*, *kaṇḍaṅgi*, *pāgai*, *tirai*, *mukkāḍu*, *tāvaṇi*, *nūlak-kaliṅgam*, *pōarvai*, *veṭṭu*, *mētai*, *Summāḍu*, *paḍam*, *mērkāṭṭi*, *iraṭṭuttunī*, *kōḍi*, *vuri*, *parivaṭṭam*, *aruvai*, *śirai*, *ponnāḍai*, *parutti*, *paṭṭu*, *pāñjāḍai*, *veṇpāñjāḍai*, are some of the terms which connote either the cloth in general or a particular kind of cloth. Almost all the above words are found in the Saṅgam literature. The various similies which are employed in the description of the texture of cloth corroborate beyond a shadow of doubt the excellence and fineness of quality. Textile industries were not the monopoly of men. Women too, took an active part in the industries. The women weavers were known as *paruttippeṇḍir*.⁵¹ There was a particular colony at Madurai which was occupied by weavers. It was popularly known as *aruvai vidi*.⁵² A part of Mayavaram (Thanjavur District) is today known as *Koranāḍu*, a word derived from *kūrai nāḍu* which means the land of textiles. There is another village near Kumbakonam in the same district by the name *Tugili*, which is derived from the word *tugil*, which means cloth. Even today it proves a small textile centre. Industries in general and textiles in particular flourished in ancient Tamilnadu. To all intents and purposes textiles (cloth) was placed on a par with agriculture (food).⁵³ There is every reason to think that in Malaya Tamilians are mentioned as *kileng*, a word that has derived from *kaliṅgam* (cloth) because the ancient Tamilnadu has exported cloths to eastern countries in large quantity.

50. *Śilappatikāram* 14: 106-112 commentary of Adiyārkkunallār.

51. *Puranānūru* 125, 326.

52. *Śilappatikāram* 14:207.

53. *Puranānūru* 189.

15. *Fine Arts*

The Tamil culture was classified into three parts namely, literature, music and drama (Muttamizh). It is a unique feature of the Tamil culture. The human faculty consists of intellectual, emotional and physical aspects. They are known as thinking, feeling and willing respectively. The intellectual faculty blossoms into literature, the emotional part results in music and the physical aspect leads to drama. Music and drama come under the jurisdiction of fine arts. Music, which occupies the central position, serves as a harmonious link between literature and drama. The word *isai* which implies music has a significant meaning. It means to make the audience yield. The very fact that all the Saṅgam literatures are in the form of poetry indicates clearly that the ancient Tamil writers had a musical bent of mind. The sentiments as well as thoughts were expressed through the metrical medium. The four main metrical forms namely, *veṇbā*, *agaval*, *vaṇji*, and *kalippā* are based on perfect music. There were three main categories of musical instruments namely, wind instrument, string instrument and percussion instrument represented by flute, lyre and drum respectively. The unique feature of these three words is that the special letter *zh* which is peculiar to Tamil, is found in every word. Hence, it corroborates the high antiquity of Tamil music. The *Tolkāppiam* and Perāśiriyar's commentary throw ample light on the technicalities of drama. The *Śilappatikāram*, an epic in tripartite Tamil, gives a kaleidoscopic variety of minute details on music, dance, aesthetics and drama. The canto on *araṇgetṭram* and the commentaries on it form a book of knowledge in fine arts. Painting was one of the fine arts which deserves special mention. *Paripāḍal* gives a detail of paintings on various themes. The sketch was known as *punaya ḍiviyam*.⁵⁴ Apart from these fine arts, sculpture, embroidery, beauty culture and various types of workmanship were in vogue. The various fine arts that flourished proclaim to the world the emotional development and aesthetic advancement of the Tamils of yore.

To conclude the Tamil Society of the Saṅgam Age was perfect from various points of view.

54. Maṇimekalai 16: 131.

Dr. S. G. MOGHE

ON ŚŪLAPĀṆĪ - THE INTERPRETER OF THE YĀJÑAVALKYA - SMṚTI

According to MM. Dr. P. V. Kane, ŚŪlapāṇi flourished between A.D. 1375 and 1460. His earliest work is a commentary **Dīpakalikā* on the *Yājñavalkya-smṛti* (YS). It is a very brief commentary though the author of this commentary quotes about 63 works, as is clear from the index given by the learned editor J. R. Gharpure, at the end of this work.

In this paper, therefore, an attempt is being made to estimate the position of ŚŪlapāṇi, as the interpreter of the YS, particularly from the *mīmāṃsā* point of view, in comparison with the other commentators like Viṣṇāneśvara, Viśvarūpa, Aparārka, Mitramiśra and Nīlakaṇṭha, the author of the well-known digest published under the head '*Bhagavantabhāskara*'. The following points may be noted in connection with ŚŪlapāṇi as the interpreter of the YS.

I. ŚŪlapāṇi quotes the *Pūrva-mīmāṃsā sūtra* '*phalārthatvāt tat*' VI. 1.4, in the course of his comments¹ on the YS. I. 1, only once. Here also he does not wish to introduce any hot debate on the *mīmāṃsā* technical point. But it is only incidentally that he refers to the *Pūrva-mīmāṃsā sūtra*. Casually it may be added here that ŚŪlapāṇi never introduces the comments of Śabara or Kumārila on the *Pūrva-mīmāṃsā sūtras* of Jaimini, in his brief commentary. In this respect, he stands unfavourably compared with the other commentators like Viṣṇāneśvara, Aparārka and Viśvarūpa and Mitramiśra.

* References are to the edition of the *Dīpakalikā* of ŚŪlapāṇi on the *Yājñavalkya-smṛti*, published by J. R. Gharpure, under the *Dharmaśāstra Granthamālā* No. 26, in 1939.

1. *taḥ karmāṇy āha jaiminiḥ* — (6-1-4).
'*phalārthatvāt tat*' *iti*. P. 1.

II. Śūlapāṇi touches upon those places of the YS that are left untouched by the master Vijñāneśvara. In this respect the attention of a careful reader can be invited to the important comments² of Śūlapāṇi on the YS III. 20 and III 221-26. Here Śūlapāṇi suggests the points of *vyavasthāvikalpa* and *upalakṣaṇā*, not previously suggested by Vijñāneśvara. It is also significant to note that the points suggested by our author are not highly technical.

III. Sometimes, however, Śūlapāṇi shows complete agreement with Vijñāneśvara on some of the *mīmāṃsā* technical points. In fact, he tries to copy Vijñāneśvara, by introducing some minor changes in the words here and there. This point can be best illustrated by inviting the attention of the readers to the commentary of both Vijñāneśvara and Śūlapāṇi on the YS. I. 169. Here both the authors hold that in interpreting this text of the YS, the principle of *pratiprasava* is to be followed. But there appears a slight change³ in the wording of both the authors that deserve to be noted. Another case of this type can be cited by reading the comments of both Vijñāneśvara and Śūlapāṇi on the YS. II 1. Both the commentators treat this as a case of *anuvāda*. But the outlook at the back of adopting the principle of *anuvāda* is quite different, as is evident from the comments⁴ of both the commentators.

IV. At times, however, it can be noticed that whatever points are only hinted at or suggested by Vijñāneśvara in his commentary, are properly dealt with by Śūlapāṇi by introducing the point of *upalakṣaṇā*. In this respect, the attention of the readers can be invited to the important comments of both the commentators on the YS I. 170⁵. By the word cow (go) Śūlapāṇi suggests⁶ inclusion of *aja* and *mahiṣi*. The same point is expressly suggested⁷ by Vijñāneśvara, without using the term *upalakṣaṇā*. Here a serious student may mark only the slight difference in the language of both the commentators. Incidentally, it may be noted here that though it is not the main intention of Śūlapāṇi to support the case of *upalakṣaṇā* yet, the line⁸ quoted by him from the *Manu-mṛ̥ṣī*,

2. *garbhamāsatasyāśaucam strī viṣayam sadyaḥ śaucam sapinḍaviṣayam iti vyavasthāthā vikalpah* III-20 (p.77).

3. *paryuṣitādinām pratiprasavam āha* Śūlapāṇi - P. 21. and *paryuṣitasya pratiprasavam āha*. Vijñāneśvara - P. 57.

4. *yadyapi rājadharme 'vyavahārān svayam paśyet' ity uktam tathāpi dharmaśāstrānusāreṇety ādinā guṇavidhānārtham ayam anuvādah*, Śūla. P. 36. Read also : Vijñā. P. 125.

5. *Sandhiny anirdiśāvat sāgo payaḥ parivarjayet auṣtram ekaśapham straiṇam āraṇyakam athāvikam*. Yājñā I-170.

6. *gograhaṇam ajāmahiṣy upalakṣaṇārtham*. Śūla P. 21.

7. *evam ajāmahiṣyoś cānirdośayoḥ payo varjayet*. Vijñā. P. 57.

8. *'ārūṇyānāṃ ca sarveṣāṃ mṛgāṇāṃ mahiṣiṇ vīnā' iti (5-9) manu vacanāt*

lends support to his contention. In this respect, it deserves to be noted that it is Nīlakaṇṭha who generally quotes the authoritative texts in his support to suggest the case of the *upalakṣaṇā*. A curious reader may be pleased to read his comments⁹ in his digest known as *mayūkhās*.

V. Besides, sometimes, however, both Śūlapāṇi and Vijñāneśvara come to the same conclusion on the *mīmāṃsā* technical point but care to give different reasons for arriving at the same conclusion. This point can be best illustrated by inviting the attention of the readers to the comments¹⁰ of both Vijñāneśvara and Śūlapāṇi on the YS II. 191.¹¹ Here both the commentators treat this as a case of *punarvacana*. Vijñāneśvara says that *punarvacana* is meant in order to show proper respect to the well-wishers. But Śūlapāṇi however gives a different but rather a minor reason in view of the expression '*vedajñānvādī viśeṣābhidhānārtham*'.

VI. At times, however, it deserves to be noted that our author Śūlapāṇi disagrees with Vijñāneśvara even on some of the *mīmāṃsā* technical points. This point can be best illustrated by referring to the commentaries of both Vijñāneśvara and Śūlapāṇi. Vijñāneśvara interprets¹² the text of the YS I. 249 as a fit case of *niyama vidhi*; while Śūlapāṇi treats this as a case of *parisaṃkhyā vidhi*¹³. In this context, it is significant to note that Śūlapāṇi does not expressly refer to the view of Vijñāneśvara and also does not try to advance any arguments to refute the view point of Vijñāneśvara. He simply remains satisfied by expressing his view point, without at the same time properly examining or detecting the flaw in the view point of the predecessors in the field.

VII. It is interesting to note that there are some important places of the YS on which any curious student of the *Pūrva-mīmāṃsā* is likely to expect some important observations on the part of Śūlapāṇi. But, in this respect also, the readers are disappointed by our author. This point can be properly expounded by referring to the commentary of Śūlapāṇi on the YS. I. 53, II. 135 and III. 219. These are the important places of the YS, where the *mīmāṃsā* technical points of *ṛtuidvayaviro-*

9. Read also : *saṃskāra mayūkhā* P. 71; *vyavahāramayūkhā* P. 50.

10. *teṣāṃ vacanam itaraiḥ kāryam ity etad ādarārtham punarvacanam*. Vijñā P. 277. *veda jñātvādiviśeṣābhidhānārtham punarvacanam*. Śūla. P. 63.

11. *dharmajñāḥ śucayo 'lubdḥāḥ bhavedyuh kāryacintakāḥ | kartavyaṃ vacanam teṣāṃ samūha hitavādinām ||* Yājñ. II. 191 (P. 277)

12. *pitṛsevitam śrāddhaśiṣṭam iṣṭais saha bhuñjita. niyama evāyam na parisaṃkhyā.*

Vijñā. P. 85.

13. "*bhūñjita pitṛsevitam*" *iti na vidhiḥ kiṃtu nityopavāsarikte parisaṃkhyāvidhiḥ*. Śūla. P. 28.

dha,¹⁴ *paryudasa*,¹⁵ *puruṣārtha* and *kratvartha*¹⁶ are introduced by Vijñāneśvara and Nīlakaṇṭha in their comments on the above verses respectively. This observation, in other words, means that Śūlapāṇi does not appear to be a very serious student of the *Pūrva-mīmāṃsā* and his view points do not deserve any special consideration and admiration from the serious readers of *Pūrva-mīmāṃsā*.

VIII Sometimes, however, it is interesting to note that even the minor *mīmāṃsā* technical points do not at all occur to the mind of Śūlapāṇi, in his comments on some of the portions of the YS. In this respect, the attention of a curious reader may be invited to his commentary on the YS - III. 254¹⁷. Though in this verse, the expression 'samah niśi' occurs, yet Śūlapāṇi in his comments¹⁸ on this verse, states that this kind of expiation should be performed for a whole year. The expression 'varṣamekam' of Śūlapāṇi, is in sharp contrast with the author of the *Mitākṣarā*, who holds¹⁹ that this expiation should be performed for three years continuously. The expression 'varṣatraya-paryantam' is significant. Here, incidentally it may be noted that it is Nīlakaṇṭha who in his *prāyaścittamayūkha* applies the principle of the *kapiñjala nyāyu* to this verse and comes to the conclusion of the three years. Casually it may be noted that Śūlapāṇi has not at all introduced any *mīmāṃsā* maxim. The same is the case with the author of the *Mitākṣarā*. But the only difference between Vijñāneśvara and Nīlakaṇṭha is that Vijñāneśvara has not used the *mīmāṃsā* principle but given the same opinion; whereas Nīlakaṇṭha has used the *mīmāṃsā* principle and his decision also is in complete agreement with the opinion of Vijñāneśvara.

IX. It is significant to note that Śūlapāṇi in his comments on the YS never enters into any acute discussions of *Pūrva-mīmāṃsā*. In this respect, he stands unfavourably compared with Vijñāneśvara²⁰ who

14. See also : *vṛttidvayavirodha* on Yājñ. II-135, 136.

(*vyavahāramayūkha*. P. 142).

15. See also : *paryudāsa* on Yājñ. III - 219 (*prāyaścittamayūkha* P. 2).

16. Read also : Vijñāneśvara on Yājñ. 1-53 (Yājñ. P. 16 and 17), and Nīlakaṇṭha on Yājñ. I-53 (*vyavahāramayūkha* P. 107).

17. *vālavāsa jaṭi vāpi brahmahatyāvratam caret |*
piṇyākam vā kaṇān vāpi bhakṣayet trisamā niśi |

Yājñ. III. 254 (P. 433).

18. *athavā tilakstham taṇḍulādikaṇān vā rātrau varṣam ekam bhakṣayet.*
Śūla. P. 98.

19. *athavā piṇyākam piṇḍitam trisamā varṣatrayaparyantam rātrau bhakṣayet.*
Vijñā. P. 43.

20. *viśayavyavasthā and upasamhāra* on Yājñ. I. 256 (P. 92-93) Vijñāneśvara.
niyama and parisamkhyā on Yājñ. I. 81 Vijñā. (P. 25-26).

dvayoh prānyanti nyāya and nityūnuṣāda on Yājñ. II - 135-136 (P. 242).

introduces highly technical and recondite discussions on the YS I.256; II. 135-36 and also I. 81. But that is not the case with the commentary of our author.

X. Sometimes, however, it is noticed that Nīlakaṇṭha, the author of the twelve *mayūkhas*, also relies on the view point of Śūlapāṇi, particularly in the matter of resorting to *arthavāda*. While discussing the topic of the expiation for cutting off the tree, Nīlakaṇṭha quotes a verse from the *Viṣṇu-purāṇa* I. 12.10²¹. This verse means that if any person cuts the spreading creeper, when the moon is shining on it, he will incur sin of killing a brahmin. Now the question is whether the sin arising as a result of cutting off the branch of a tree is similar to the sin arising as a result of killing a brahmin or not. Here Nīlakaṇṭha opines²² that this passage is merely a case of condemnatory *arthavāda*. He further supports his own view point by quoting the view of Śūlapāṇi²³ in favour who also holds or equates the sin of killing a brahmin with the sin arising out of the cutting of a creeper. In this respect, it can be further added that this view is taken from the other works of Śūlapāṇi. Moreover, it should be noted here that Śūlapāṇi has not at all quoted this stanza from the *Viṣṇu-purāṇa*, though he has quoted it about twenty-five times.

XI. Vijñāneśvara agrees with Nīlakaṇṭha in treating that in the case of *sāmya atideśa*, the expiation should be lesser than the original expiation. This is particularly evident from his valuable comments²⁴ on the YS III. 265. Nīlakaṇṭha, in his discussion on the YS III. 228, refers to the opinion of Bhavadeva and Śūlapāṇi, who hold that though in the text of the *Yājñavalkya-smṛti* III. 228, there is the equal mention of the censure of the Vedas along with the killing of a brahmin, yet it does not indicate the less expiation in spite of the *vācanika atideśa*. They further hold that as regards the half or three fourth of the expiation, there is no authority. Nīlakaṇṭha, however, refutes the view point of Bhavadeva and Śūlapāṇi who hold that the equal mention is a case of *arthavāda* and not of *atideśa*. This view point is refuted by Nīlakaṇṭha by pointing out that *Veda-nindā* is not a serious crime as is the case with the killing of a brahmin. Moreover, Manu has not included the censure of the Vedas under the category of great sins. It may be noted here that even Manu has laid down some lesser expiations in the case

21. *bhinatti vīrudho yastu vīrut samsthe niśkare;
patram vā śārayaty ekam brahmahatyām sa vindati*

Viṣṇu-purāṇa I-12-10.

Quoted in *prāyaścittamayūkha*. P. 233.

22. *tadarthavādamātram*. *prāyaścittamayūkha* P. 233.

23. *Śūlapāṇirapy evameva*. *ibid*. P. 233.

24. *airātideśa sāmārthyād gocarmavasana goparicaryāḍibhir katipayair nyūnatvam avagamyaite*. Vijñāneśvara on *Yājñ.* P. 57.

of minor crimes like the *Veda-nindā*, stealing of the property of another. The text of Manu also favours the view point of Nīlakaṇṭha. He further cites the practical example '*rājñasamo mantri*'. This example also points in the same direction of the inferiority or degradation in level of the minister as compared with the king. In this respect, the comments²⁵ of Nīlakaṇṭha are noteworthy and deserve to be noted. Thus, following the same analogy here, we can say that the expiation must become less in the case of the minor offences, when in particular it becomes a case of *atideśa*. A curious reader may further read the detailed discussion in the *prāyaścitta mayūkha* PP. 14 to 16. Here it is reasonable to agree with Nīlakaṇṭha on this point, setting²⁶ aside the views of Bhavadeva and Śūlapāṇi. In this connection, it deserves to be noted here that this special view of *arīhavadā* particularly of Śūlapāṇi is not to be noticed in the commentary *Dīpakalikā* on the YS III. 228. Possibly Nīlakaṇṭha is referring to this view of Śūlapāṇi available in his other works. In this context, it is interesting to remember the view point of Haradatta on the *Āpastamba-dharmasūtra*, particularly when he asserts positively that in the case of *atideśa*, there should be some deduction of matter in the extended case. Haradatta in his commentary on the *Āpastamba-dharmasūtra*, I. 8. 26. 5, suggests²⁷ that in the extended case (*vikṛti*) one half of the original (*prakṛti*) should be adopted following the principle of the *smṛtanyāya*. So taking into account the favourable view points of authors on *Dharmaśāstra* like Vijnāneśvara and Haradatta on the technical point of *atideśa*, it will be reasonable to accept the view point of Nīlakaṇṭha.

XII. Sometimes, however, Nīlakaṇṭha supports his view point by quoting the view point of Śūlapāṇi in his favour. It deserves to be noted here that the view thus quoted is not to be seen in the present commentary *Dīpakalikā*. Possibly this view also has been quoted from the other digest of Śūlapāṇi. This point can be best illustrated by inviting the attention of the readers to the commentary on the YS III. 255. Here the topic under discussion is whether the expiation of a thread ceremony is an altogether different expiation or whether it is in addition to the expiations for eating impure things of the body. Nīlakaṇṭha²⁸ quotes here the two divergent opinions. According to Śūlapāṇi, the expiation of the second thread ceremony is to be combined with the other expiations for eating impure things. It also seems likely

-
25. '*rājñasamo mantri*' ity ādau tu nyūnatā pratyakṣagamya
prāyaścittamayūkha P. 14.
26. *etenātideśe pūrṇa prāyaścitam vadantau śūlapāṇi bhavidevān apāstau.*
ibid P. 16.
27. *atideśau cārḍham prāpyati iti smṛta nyāyas tena strīṇām ardha piṭṭy arthavacanam iti.* *Āpastamba-dharmasūtra* P. 146.
28. See also: *prāyaścittamayūkha* P. 114.

that the view point of Śūlapāṇi is based on the use of the word *ca* occurring in the text. He further cites the opposite view of other scholars who treat this as an independent expiation and hence it is not to be included in other expiations laid down for eating impure things. It is interesting to note that Nīlakaṇṭha passes over this point in silence. Here it is possible to hold that Nīlakaṇṭha agrees with the first view in view of the preference he has shown in presenting the view points. In this connection, it will be reasonable to quote the view point of MM Dr. P.V. Kane who thinks that in such cases the author agrees with the last view quoted.

Incidentally, it must be noted here that this view point of Śūlapāṇi is not to be found in the present commentary. Possibly this view appears in the other works of our author.

XIII. The view points of Śūlapāṇi are further quoted by Mitramiśra in his commentary on the *Yājñavalkya-smṛiti* and also in his digest known as *Viramītrodaya*. This means that some of the views of Śūlapāṇi have either become acceptable or rejectable to the later authors of nibandhas. This statement can be further supported by inviting the attention of the readers to the commentary of Mitramiśra on the YS. I. 161. Here the topic under discussion is the persons from whom food should not be eaten by a *brahmacārī*. Here in the list of the persons from whom the food is not to be eaten the word *gaṇadikṣi* occurs. According to Vijñāneśvara,²⁹ it means one who performs many sacrifices. Śūlapāṇi, however, treats³⁰ this as one who performs sacrifices for the group (in common). Mitramiśra, however, understands this as one who performs many consecrations or sacrifices. He further points out³¹ that the meaning given by Śūlapāṇi cannot be accepted, because it would involve the fault of repetition or reproduction in view of the text of YS I. 163 in which the word *grāmayājī* again occurs. The view of Mitramiśra deserves consideration and we cannot understand both the words in one and the same sense. It may be incidentally noted here that in interpreting the word *grāmayājī* occurring in the YS I 163, Mitramiśra follows Vijñāneśvara. The view point of Śūlapāṇi is again referred to by Mitramiśra on the YS p 232 and 257. As here no technical point of *Pūrvamīmāṃsā* is raised, I do not think it fit to invite the attention of the readers to this point.

XIV. Sometimes, however, Śūlapāṇi refers to the *mīmāṃsā* technical terms by suggestion without wording the language in which the

29. *gaṇadikṣi bahuyājakaḥ*. Vijñāneśvara on Yājñ. P. 54.

30. *gaṇajīvi gaṇayājakaḥ*. Śūlapāṇi on Yājñ. P. 20.

31. *gaṇadikṣi. gaṇayājakaḥ iti Śūlapāṇiḥ tan na grāmayājīpadena paunarukty-āpūṇāt* Mitramiśra on Yājñ. P. 239.

same is generally worded in the *Pūrva-mīmāṃsā*. The attention of the readers can be invited to the commentary of Śūlapāṇi on the YS I. 231. He points out³² that the offering of the seat (*viṣṭara*) pointed out in the text of the YS I. 229 and the offering of the lamp in the case of the brahmins invited for the *śrāddha* ceremony, should be done by the mode of *kāṇḍānusamaya*. He further quotes the view of Kātyāyana, that it should be done following the mode of *padārthānusamaya*. Hence the best way³³ is to resort to option. Here the expression '*kāṇḍānuśayaḥ*' is in agreement with the expression *kāṇḍānusamayaḥ* resorted to in the *Pūrva-mīmāṃsā*. The same is the case with the expression *padārthānuśayaḥ*. Here also it is significant to note that the mode of *padārthānusamaya* and *kāṇḍānusamaya* is neither suggested by Vijñāneśvara nor by Nīlakaṇṭha. Hence, the utility of Śūlapāṇi, though meagre, cannot be gained.

XV. It is also important to remember, of course, incidentally that Śūlapāṇi does neither try to follow nor to contradict the *mīmāṃsā* views of Aparārka on the YS, the famous predecessor and the commentator of the voluminous commentary on the said work. This also indicates that Śūlapāṇi does not enter into acute discussions of *Pūrva-mīmāṃsā* and does not impress the readers by going to the root of the subject by quoting the views of Jaimini, Śabara or Kumārila or throwing flood of light upon the terms in his own lucid language. In this respect, he stands unfavourably compared with Vijñāneśvara, Nīlakaṇṭha and Śaṅkarācārya, the commentator of the *Vedānta sūtras* of Bādarāyaṇa,

XVI, It is needless to say that the commentary of Śūlapāṇi does not possess any distinguishing feature as is the case with the commentary of Mitrāmśra on the YS, particularly in the matter of lucid and detailed treatment³⁴ on the *mīmāṃsā* technical term *samuccaya*. By this remark, I do not want to state that Śūlapāṇi does not at all employ the *mīmāṃsā* term *samuccaya*. The only important thing to be borne in mind here is that Śūlapāṇi has employed the term *samuccaya* but it has not got any distinguishing characteristic.

XVII It appears that in his commentary on the YS, Śūlapāṇi makes a very meagre use of the doctrines of *Pūrva-mīmāṃsā*. He, in his commentary, uses the *mīmāṃsā* terms like *vikalpa*, *upalakṣaṇa*, *niṣedha*, *parisaṃkhyā*, *pratiprasava*, *anuvāda*, *purarvacana*, *niyama*, *vyavasthita vikalpa*, *padārthānuśaya* and *kāṇḍānuśaya* etc. Mathematically speaking this figure will not exceed the number fifteen. So, it can be

32. *viṣṭarāḍi dīpadānānta kāṇḍānuśayaḥ*. Śūlapāṇi on Yājñ. P. 27.

33. *kātyāyane tu padārthānuśayaḥ ato vikalpaḥ*. ibid. P. 27.

34. See also : My article on 'Samuccaya - A neglected Mīmāṃsā term by Vijñāneśvara' A B.O.R.I. Poona. LXI - 1971 (pp. 83-92).

said that he does not impress the readers by his profound scholarship. Incidentally, it should be noted that he used the above mentioned terms very rarely and not repeatedly.

Conclusion

Taking into account the above aspects revealed in the commentary of Śūlapāṇi, it is possible to say with reasonable certainty that the commentary of Śūlapāṇi on the YS cannot be considered as a proper contribution to the science of interpretation otherwise known as the *Pūrva-mīmāṃsā*. Śūlapāṇi has made very meagre use of the doctrines of the *Pūrva-mīmāṃsā* in the course of his discussion. At times, it seems that he copies the view points of Vijñāneśvara and also shows boldness to express the view point different from Vijñāneśvara, without at the same time, introducing any hot debate on the technical point. At times, however, he touches upon some of the places of the YS left untouched by Vijñāneśvara and Nīlakaṇṭha. He is not careful in wording the language in which it is generally worded by the well-known scholars of *Pūrva-mīmāṃsā* and *Dharmaśāstra*. Sometimes, however, his opinions are refused by Nīlakaṇṭha and Mitramiśra in their works particularly on the *mīmāṃsā* technical point. It may also be noted that at times Nīlakaṇṭha quotes the view points of Śūlapāṇi to support his own case of interpreting the particular text. Casually it should be borne in mind that he does not try to follow or criticize the view points of Aparārka on the YS. I may make bold to say that the commentary of Śūlapāṇi does not possess any distinguishing feature as is the case with the commentary of Mitramiśra particularly from the point of view of *samuccaya* on the YS. It is also significant to note that whatever view points of Śūlapāṇi are quoted by Nīlakaṇṭha in his digest are not to be seen in the present commentary, possibly they are quoted from the other works of the author. At times, however, the view of Śūlapāṇi referred to by Mitramiśra, find verbatim in the present text of *Dīpakalikā*. In fine, one can say that though Śūlapāṇi is not very much useful for interpreting the text of the YS, particularly from the *mīmāṃsā* view point, yet at the same time, its meagre use to a small extent, cannot be gainsaid. Hence, it can be said with reasonable certainty that he does not occupy the honourable and coveted position among the other interpreters of the YS.

SRI H.V. RAMAGOPAL

A NOTE ON ĀNDHRA PAINTERS

Āndhras, as a race are emotional with fire and drive. This basic trait has given ability to many artists, who have been frank and decisive in their realm of painting. The world famous frescoes of Ajanta, the Lēpākṣi murals and the Deccan School of painting are landmarks of the earliest Āndhra painters. The *kalamkārīs* of Kālahasti and Masulipatam are paintings on cloth, with traditional linear forms with indigenous colours also depict the folk-form of the art of painting. Painted leather figures, called *ṛōlubommalu* with rich colour harmony, depict the art of painting of the medieval times. All these art forms with rich sense of colour and vigorous form reflect the native air and the painters' fine sense of life of their times. The Āndhra painters of twentieth century, inspired by such a traditional background are equally alive to the current trends of world painting.

Among the earliest painters of the twentieth century, Sri A.S. Ram, Damerla Rama Rao, Manikonda Rama Rao, Varada Venkataratnam, Chemakuri Bhashyakarla Rao, S.N. Chamkur, Bhagirathi, Mokkapati Krishna Murthi, Ankala Venkata Subba Rao are the pioneers who have inspired the present young painters of Āndhra. All of these above noted painters have done voluminous work with zeal and zest for life.

Āndhra writers like Sri Adivi Bapiraju, Madhavapeddi Gokhale, Achanta Janakiram, Sanjeeva Dev have done good paintings. Their works are noteworthy. Like D.H. Lawrence, they are both writers and painters.

The pre-independence Āndhra painters were trained under Bengali masters like Sri Promod Kumar Chatterji, D.P. Roychowdhury and others. But the post-independence Āndhra painters have taken inspiration from the works of French painters of the twentieth century. Thus

they have assimilated the techniques of the Western painting. Contemporary Āndhra painters including youngsters and elders have taken subjects for their painting from their surrounding environment and brought secular painting into vogue.

Sri P.T. Reddy, Pilaka Narasimhamurthy, H.V. Rama Gopal, K. Srinivasulu, A. Paidi Raju, K. Seshagiri Rao, Badri Narayan and others are among the next set of Āndhra painters of the twentieth century. Some of them have done abstract paintings. With the introduction of abstract painting, the painting field in Āndhra has been doubled. Also there are youngsters with lot of talent like Sri Krishna Reddy (Paris), S.V. Rama Rao (London), Veluri Radhakrishna (Bhopal), Reddapa Naidu, A. Anjaneyulu (Madras), Devaraj, Lakshman Goud, Manmohan Dut, Madhusudana Rao (Hyderabad) and Lakshmiah (Pachhalatadiparru, Guntur). There are many more from the younger generation studying at the art institutions in Madras, Hyderabad, Bombay, Baroda and New Delhi. All of them can bring their works created by imbibing various experiences in technical studies and contribute to the richness and variety of trends in the Āndhra Painting.

Most of the Āndhra painters of today are known nationally and internationally apart from themselves being known in their own state. Rich palette and individuality in style are the real contributions in the new trends in Āndhra painting.

Some of the painters, irrespective of their age, with their voluminous contributions etc., are re-thinking now. The contemporary painting all over the world is in a melting pot. Some have begun to realize that artists should be more inspired by nature than merely book-inspired in the basic concept, maintaining at the same breath personal vision without prejudice on a wider area discovering new horizons with integrity of emotion and intuition. With such an outlook, I for one, hope that Āndhra painters at present can contribute something substantial to the world of art against the background of the country with the study of their local moorings.

An era of Neo-realism is in the offing. The distortions and disfigurations in the pseudo name of modern art may fade away like weeds. Like strong trees, true traditions and firm conventions are bound to grow slowly. A good work of art whether it is done today or thousands of years of yesterday, it should not matter for the aesthetic value judgments. The ravages of time pass by. The contributions create history and stand for times to come.

Only a fusion of technical excellence (evolved over centuries) and imaginative excellence inherited and cultivated with care will be the

true work of contribution in the art world. We all look for evolution and aspiration (as beacon lights) for the growing awareness of human beings into a fine aesthetic value, contributions in the name of arts and letters.

The present contribution of painters is in the approach stage; the best works as significant contributions, about which one can boast of are yet to be made.

Let us hope the painters of Āndhra, young or old do not forget the essence of the words of Gandhiji – “I keep the doors of my windows open. Let breeze flow in from all directions. Only thing I want is that my feet should not be blown off.”

SRI B.V. SRINIVASA RAO

LAKKAṆṆA DAṆḌANĀYAKA

Introduction

Lakkaṇṇa Daṇḍanāyaka was the most affectionate minister to Vīraśaiva ruler of the Saṅgama dynasty of Vijayanagara empire by name Devarāya II, whose period is fixed from A.D. 1419 to A.D. 1446. He was the commander of the Vijayanagara forces and beyond all he was the personal and pet-friend of Vijayanagara Vīraśaiva King Devarāya II who was the South Indian ruler. His father's name was Heggāḍadeva; his mother's name was Ōmmāyamma. His brother's name was Mādaṇṇa-daṇḍanāyaka. He belonged to Viṣṇuvardhana gotra. By religion, he was a *vīraśaiva virakta*. He had great faith in Vīraśaivism. He was mainly responsible for the plenty and prosperity of his lord Devarāya II. He was also a great administrator and powerful soldier. He was a very good diplomat. He was a great politician also. He was a patron of art and religion. He conferred upon his lord Devarāya II his most affectionate title called "Devendra". The history of such a hero of great qualities is worthy of study.¹

Lakkaṇṇadaṇḍanāyaka as an administrator

At the very outset Lakkaṇṇadaṇḍanāyaka was the governor for Talakāḍu province (now in Mysore District). And then from A.D. 1430 to A.D. 1433, he was the governor for Muluvāyil province (corresponding to Mulubāgaḷ Taluk, Kolar District). When he was at Mulubāgaḷ, he granted the villages namely, Virūpākṣapura, Guṭṭahaḷḷi, Suradēvihaḷḷi, Mahādēvanahaḷḷe, Kunudēvanahaḷḷi etc., to Sri Prasanna Virūpākṣa Temple of Mulubāgaḷ to make use of their revenue for several festivals of the temple and this is confirmed by a Kannada inscription found at Mulubāgaḷ dated Kaliyuga 4532 years, śaka 1352-53, Caitrādi

1. Pages 77-85, Indian Antiquary Vol. LVII, May, 1928. Volume 57.

Vikrama 1488, Meṣādi solar year in Bengal 837, Kollam 605–606 corresponding to A.D. 1430–1431 and it belongs to Sādhāraṇanāma saṃvatsara.²

In the year A.D. 1434 Lakkaṇṇadaṇḍanāyaka handed over Tēkal province to Sāḷuva Gōpa Tippa as per the orders of the King Deva-rāya II. This is confirmed by Kannada inscriptions belonging to Pramā-dīca saṃvatsara dated to Kaliyuga 4535, śaka year 1355–56, Caitrādi Vikrama 1491, Meṣādi solar year in Bengal 840, Kollam 608–609, corresponding to A.D. 1433–1–34.³ Lakkaṇṇadaṇḍanāyaka who stepped into Pāṇḍyan region in about A.D. 1431 was at Tiruvaṇṇāmalai for some time. From the year Subhānu of śaka 1327 current to the year Vibhava saṃvatsara (corresponding from A.D. 1405 to A.D. 1451) a period of forty-seven years, Lakkaṇṇadaṇḍanāyaka and Mādaṇṇadaṇḍanāyaka ruled the kingdom of Madurai as Naik viceroys. After his regime he brought out of exile, at Kāḷaiyārkoil, the illegitimate son of the late son of Pāṇḍyan king and his concubine Abirāmi, by name Sundarattōḷ-Māvali-Vanadirāyan and installed him as the ruler of Madurai. After him his brothers namely, Kāḷaiyār Sōmanār, Aṇjāta Perumāḷ Muttarasa, Tiru-malai ruled over Madurai.⁴

The conquests of Lakkaṇṇadaṇḍanāyaka

As a soldier, in order to increase the prestige of Vijayanagara empire, he at first started his conquest of Gulbarga in the year A.D. 1443. When Muslims of Gulbarga invaded the boundary of Vijayanagar empire, the boundary people led by pālyagār of Gummāreḍḍipura and Pemmasāni Siṅgappa were ready to help their lord Devarāya II in sacking Muslims of Gulbarga. In this connection the Vijayanagara forces as a result of their attack of Gulbarga, not only lost thousands of soldiers but also became tired. It needed rest therefore on seeking this, Pālyagār Doḍḍavasantanāyaka after asking Vijayanagara forces to take rest for some time, again invaded Gulbarga with great vigour. In the sword fight between Doḍḍa Vasantanāyaka and Sultan of Gulbarga, Sultan's sword was cut into pieces. Then both started wrestling in which Sultan was defeated. In the end under the leadership of Lakkaṇṇadaṇḍanāyaka, Vijayanagara forces invaded and finally captured Gulbarga and

2. Page 65, Epigraphia Carnatica Vol. X, Inscription No. 2 Mulubagal, (Kolar District, Mysore State).
3. Page 153, Epigraphia Carnatica, Vol. X. Inscription No. 1, Malur, Kolar District, Mysore State.
4. Page 10, Indian Antiquary, Volume 43, 1914.
Page 10, Sources of Vijayanagar History, by S.K. Iyengar.
Page 340, South Indian History and Culture, Volume II, by S.K. Iyengar.
Page 347, South Indian History and culture, Volume II, by S.K. Iyengar, Appendix E (Tamil literary source Maduraitalavaralāru) Account of the sacred city of Madura).

brought countless Muslims as captives to Vijayanagar. Thus the victorious Lakkannaḍaṇḍanāyaka was allowed to mint coins named after him.⁵

Then Lakkannaḍaṇḍanāyaka with the help of Pāṇḍyan King Ari-kesari Parākrama Pāṇḍya conquered the northern part of Ceylon in the period between November A.D. 1442 and April A.D. 1443. During this time Parākrama Bāhu VI of Kōṭe dynasty was the ruler of Ceylon. Lakkannaḍaṇḍanāyaka won the title 'Dakṣiṇa samudrādhiśvara' Lord of the Southern Ocean).⁶

The coins of Lakkannaḍaṇḍanāyaka.

Lakkannaḍaṇḍanāyaka issued copper coins. On the reverse of his coin symbol of elephant is found. On its reverse letter "L" and legend namely "Māna, Daṇḍāya, Kaṁ" reading the name of Lakkannaḍaṇḍanāyaka.⁷

Lakkannaḍaṇḍanāyaka as a lover of literature.

Lakkannaḍaṇḍanāyaka was a great man of letters. He wrote in Kannada a book called "Śivatattvacintāmaṇi". It is in the form of verse-Vārdhikaṣaṭpadi. It contains 2221 verses in fifty-four sandhis. It records Viraśaiva Philosophy.⁸

-
5. The Bakhar of Gummāreḍḍipālya Chiefs (Kannada Publication by M.S. Puttanna, Mysore University Publication).
 6. Page 139, Annual Report of Epigraphy. 1916, Madras.
Page 103, Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society (Ceylon Branch) Colombo, volume XXVI.
Page 300-301, Article on Bāṇas in South Indian History by Dr. T.V. Mahalingam.
Pages 1580-1581, Volume II, part 3, Mysore Gazetteer, Rao Sahib Hayavadana Rao.
 7. Page 167, The Journal of Andhra Historical Research Society, Volume IV Rajahmundry.
Para 31, Annual Report of South Indian Epigraphy for 1905, Madras.
 8. Vide page 604 to 610 Basavanal Commemoration Volume. Dharvar 1956 Editors H.F. Kattemuni and M.G. Virupaksha.

Dr. BISWANATH BHATTACHARYA

A NOTE ON BHARTṚMITRA THE MĪMĀṂSAKA

Bhartṛmitra was a pre-Kumārila bhaṭṭa mīmāṃsaka of distinction. His view on the nature of *śrotra* has been ridiculed by Kumārila in the *Śabda-nītyatā-dhikaraṇa* of his *Ślokavārttika*. Pārthasārathimīśra in his *Nyāyaratnākara* on the *Ślokavārttika*¹ clarifies Kumārila's anonymous reference to Bhartṛmitra.²

The same view has been referred to by Jayantabhaṭṭa in the *Śabdapramāṇa-prarūpaṇāhnikā* of his *Nyāyamañjarī*.³ Cakradhara-bhaṭṭa elucidates this reference in his *Nyāyamañjarī-granthibhaṅga*.⁴

Cakradhara informs us that Bhartṛmitra was the author of the *Tantrasūddhi* and some other *prakaraṇa* works.⁵

Again, Bhartṛmitra's view on the fivefold relationship that *lakṣaṇā* bears to the *vāc्यārtha* has been quoted by Someśvarabhaṭṭa in

1. 'imam eva ca saṃskāraṃ śabdagrahaṇakāraṇam/
kecit tu paṇḍitammanyāḥ śrotram ity abhimanvate/
Ślokavārttika with Pārthasārathi-Mīśra's *Nyāyaratnākara*, 130-131, p. 763. Chowkhamba edn., Benares, 1898-99.
2. atra bhartṛmitro vadati, na śrotram nāma kiñcit, tasya ca dhvani janyaḥ saṃskāra iti dvayam kalpyam, ādau dhvani janyaḥ saṃskāra eva śrotram, tad upanyasyopālabhate imam iti dvayena, *Nyāya-ratnākara* on *Ślokavārttika*, ibid.
3. api ca bhavatām evaiṣa doṣo yeṣām ākāśam eva śrotram ity abhyupagamaniyamo mīmāṃsakānām tu nāvaśyam ākāśam eva śrotram kāryārthāpattikalpitam tu kim api kāraṇamātram pratipuruṣa niyatam śrotram iti nātiprasaṅgaḥ. tathā ca bhartṛmitraḥ pavanaajanitasamskārapakṣo bhavatu. tathāpi nātiprasaṅgaḥ niyatadeśasyaiva tatra saṃskārāt, *Nyāyamañjarī*, *Āhnika* 3, p. 213, Vizianagaram Sanskrit Series, Part 1, Benares, 1895.
4. tathā ca bhartṛmitreti. Bhartṛmitrākhyas tantrasūddhyādi prakaraṇakṛṇ mīmāṃsakah 'karnaśaṣkulyām pavanaajanitah saṃskārah śrotram' ity āha. tadanvaya-vyatirekānuvidhāyitvāc chabdagrahaṇāsya, *Nyāyamañjarī-granthibhaṅga*, *Āhnika* 3, p. 86, L.D. Series, Ahmedabad, 1972.
5. *Bhartṛmitrākhyas tantrasūddhyādi prakaraṇakṛṇ mīmāṃsakah*....., ibid.

his *Kāvyaḍarśa* on Mammaṭabhaṭṭa's *Kāvyaṭprakāśa*.⁶ The same has been done by Māṇikyacandra in his *Saṅketa* on the *Kāvyaṭprakāśa*.⁷

The above view has also been cited anonymously by Abhinavagupta in his *Locana* on Ānandavardhana's *Dhvanyāloka*⁸ and Gopendratripurahara in his *Kāvyaṭlāṅkāra-kāmadhenu* on Vāmana's *Kāvyaṭlāṅkāra-sūtravṛtti*.⁹

It is, however, not possible to assert that the two views of Bhartṛmitra considered above had been recorded by him in his *Tantra-suddhi*.

6.*tad-yogaś ca mukhyārthāsannatvam|*
tat pañcadhā ācārya-bhartṛmitreṇa uktam -
abhidheyena sambandhāt sādṛśyāt samavāyataḥ|
vaiparītyāt kriyāyogāl lakṣaṇā pañcadhā matā||
Kāvyaḍarśa on Mammaṭa's *Kāvya-prakāśa*, Part 1, *ullāsa* 2, pp. 16-17,
Rājasthāna-purātana-granthamālā Jodhpur, 1959,
 It is striking that the same verse appears with some minor variants in the
Agni-purāṇa as follows :
abhidheyena.....sāmīpyāt samavāyataḥ|
vaiparītyāt.....matā||
Agni-purāṇa, Vol. 3, 344. 11-12, p. 228, Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta,
 (Samvat) 1933.
7.*tad-yogaś ca mukhyārthāsannatvam, tat pañcadhoktam|* *bhartṛmi-*
treṇa -
abhidheyena sambandhāt sādṛśyāt samavāyataḥ|
vaiparītyāt kriyayogāl lakṣaṇā pañcadhā matā||
Saṅketa on Mammaṭa's *Kāvya-prakāśa*, *ullāsa*, 2, pp. 27-28,
 Mysore, 1922.
8.*yad āhuḥ -*
abhidheyena sāmīpyāt sārūpyāt samavāyataḥ|
vaiparītyāt.....matā|| *iti||*
Locana on Ānandavardhana's *Dhvanyāloka*, *uddiyota* 1, p. 281, Chow-
 khamba edn., Benares, 1940.
9. "abhidheyena sambandhāt sādṛśyat samavāyataḥ|
vaiparītyāt.....matā||
iti lakṣaṇāyā nimittāni draṣṭavyāni, Kāvyaṭlāṅkāra-kāmadhenu 4, 3. 8, pp.
 132-133, Benares Sanskrit Series, Benares, 1907-08.

अव्ययीभावपरीक्षा

संस्कृतभाषायामनेकप्रकाराः समासा उपलभ्यन्ते । तदुक्तं सिद्धान्तकौमुदी-
मन्थकारेण — “समासश्चतुर्विध इति तु प्रायोवादः । अव्ययीभावतत्पुरुषबहुव्रीहि
इन्द्राधिकारबहिर्भूतानामपि ‘सह सुपा’ इति समासविधानात्” इति । किं च,

सुपां सुपा तिङा नाम्ना धातुनाथ तिङां तिङा ।

सुवन्तेनेति विज्ञेयः समासः षड्विधो बुधैः ॥¹ इति च ।

एतेषु प्रकारेष्वन्यतमस्य अव्ययीभावस्य विषये किञ्चिद्विमृश्यते ।

समासः अव्ययीभावः, तत्पुरुष इत्यादीनां किञ्चिच्छक्षणं पाणिनिर्न प्रतिपाद-
यति । किं तु अयं समासः, अयमव्ययीभाव इति शृङ्गाग्रहिक्या निर्दिशति ।
एषैव अस्य आचार्यस्य स्वाभाविकी प्रवृत्तिरिति ज्ञायते । तथा हि — ‘भूवादयो धातवः’
(1-3-1) इति पाठात् धातुसंज्ञमयं विधत्ते । ‘सर्वादीनि सर्वनामानि’ (1-1-27)
इति गणपाठादेव सर्वनामसंज्ञां व्यवस्थापयति । ‘प्राग्नीश्वरान्निपाताः’ (1-4-56)
इति सूत्रेण, ‘अधिरीश्वरे’ (1-4-97) इति सूत्रस्थरीश्वराग्रहणपर्यन्तमुक्तानां केषांचिदेव
तत्त्वदानां निपातसंज्ञां शास्ति । न तु निपातानां सर्वनाम्नां वा किञ्चिदतिरिक्तं
तत्क्षणमाह । तथैव प्रकृतेऽपि अधिकारात् समाससंज्ञामव्ययीभावसंज्ञां च विधत्ते ।
‘प्राक्कडारात्समासः’ (2-1-3) इति सूत्रेण समासाधिकारमारभमाणः, ‘कडाराः कर्म-
प्रारये’ (2-2-38) इति सूत्रे कडाराग्रहणमस्याधिकारस्य अवधिं निर्दिशति ।

द्वितीयाध्यायस्य प्रथमे द्वितीये च पादे उक्तः समास इति फलति । तथैव 'अव्ययी-
भाव' (2-1-5) इति सूत्रेण अव्ययीभावाधिकार उपक्रम्यते । 'तत्पुरुषः' (2-1-22)
इति प्रारभ्यमाणस्तत्पुरुषाधिकार इमं निवर्तयति । तथा च तत्पुरुषाधि-कारपर्यन्त
मव्ययीभावाधिकार इति, अस्मिन्नधिकारे उक्तः अव्ययीभाव इति च सिध्यति ।

अस्मिन्नधिकारे उपलभ्यमानानि सूत्राणि नीचैर्दर्शयामः —

१. अव्ययं विभक्तिसमीपसमृद्धि वृद्धयर्थाभावात्ययासंप्रतिशब्दप्रादुर्भाव- पश्चाद्यथानुपूर्व्ययोगपदसादृश्यसंप्रति साकल्यान्तवचनेषु	2-1-6
२. यथाऽसादृश्ये	2-1-7
३. यावद्वधारणे	2-1-8
४. सुप् प्रतिना मात्रार्थे	2-1-9
५. अक्षशलाकासंख्याः परिणाः	2-1-10
६. विभाषा	2-1-11
७. अपपरिवहिरञ्चवः पञ्चम्या	2-1-12
८. आङ्मर्यादाभिविध्योः	2-1-13
९. लक्षणेनाभिप्रती आभिमुख्ये	2-1-14
१०. अनुर्यत्समग्र	2-1-15
११. यस्य चायामः	2-1-16
१२. तिष्ठद् प्रभृतीनि च	2-1-17
१३. पारे मध्ये षष्ठ्या वा	2-1-18
१४. संख्या वंशयेन	2-1-19
१५. नदीभिश्च	2-1-20
१६. अन्यपदार्थे च संज्ञार्या	2-1-21

एतानि षोडश सूत्राणि अस्मिन्नधिकारे पठ्यन्ते । तेषु 'विभाषा' इतीदं
सूत्रं न स्वयं सम्पत् कंचिद्विधत्ते । किं तु केवलं वक्ष्यमाणानां समासानां विकल्पं
बोधयति । पाणिनीये सूत्रपाठे 'विभाषाऽपपरिवहिरञ्चवः पञ्चम्या' इत्येतदेकमेव
सूत्रनासीदिति ज्ञायते । भगता भाष्यकारेण तु योगविभागः कृतः । "विभाषेति

योगविभागः कर्तव्यः । विभाषेत्ययमधिकारः । ततः 'अपपरि बहिरञ्चवः ञ्चम्या' इति । कैयटेनाप्युक्तम् — 'योगविभाग इति । अन्यथा इहैवास्योपयोग भाशङ्क्येत । योगविभागे त्वधिकारो गम्यते' ² इति ।

'एतस्मादेव अधिकारात् पूर्वसूत्रोक्तानां समासानां नित्यत्वं ज्ञाप्यते' इति कौमुदी । न चैवं 'सह सुपे'ति (2-1-4) उक्तस्य समासस्यापि नित्यत्वं प्राप्नोतीति ञ्च्यम् । 'अव्ययं विभक्ती' त्यादिना समासान्तरारम्भात् ज्ञापकादयं सुप् सुपेति भासो वैकल्पिक एवेति ज्ञापनात् । अत एव पूर्वं भूतो भूतपूर्व इति कौमुदी दुदाहरणे विग्रहवाक्यं दर्शयति । क्वचित्क्वायं समासः । अन्यथा तेनैकेनैव ल्पेण गतार्थत्वात् सूत्रान्तराणां वैयर्थ्यं प्रसज्येत । आस्तामेतत् । केचिदव्ययीभावाः । केचिच्च वैकल्पिका इत्येतेन सिद्धम् । तत्र नित्यसमासे समासावयवानां यक् प्रयोगस्यानुपपन्नत्वात् विग्रहो न भवति ; तदर्थप्रतिपादनाय तु पर्याया एव पुज्यन्ते । तदाहुः — 'अविग्रहः अखपदविग्रहो वा नित्यसमासः' इति ।

अयमव्ययीभावः अव्ययं भवति । अन्वर्था हीयं संज्ञा । अव्ययी-
वाधिकारसूत्रे भाष्यकार एवमाह —

'किमर्थं महती संज्ञा क्रियते ? अन्वर्थसंज्ञा यथा विज्ञायेत — अनव्ययमव्ययं गतीति अव्ययीभावः । अव्ययीभावोऽव्ययसंज्ञो भवतीत्येतन्न वक्तव्यं भवति' ³ इति । अनव्ययमव्ययं भवतीति विग्रहं दर्शयता भाष्यकारेण, अस्मिन् शब्दे रेरि घञ् प्रतिपाद्यते । शिष्टप्रयोगपरम्परा प्राप्तत्वाद् भाष्यकारवचनप्रामाण्याच्च रेरि घञः स्वीकारे बाधकं नास्ति । अव्ययीभावोऽव्ययसंज्ञो भवतीत्येतन्न वक्तव्य-
यस्य चेदं तात्पर्यं यत् अन्वर्थसंज्ञयैव अव्ययत्वसिद्धेः अव्ययसंज्ञाविधानार्थं 'अव्ययी-
वश्च' (1-1-41) इति सूत्रं नापेक्ष्यत इति । अव्ययसंज्ञाप्रकरणे इदं सूत्रं पठ्यते । प्रत्याख्यानपक्षेऽपि अन्वर्थसंज्ञाबलादव्ययत्वं तावदिष्यत एव । किं तु अव्ययीभावस्य प्रत्यत्वं न सार्वत्रिकम् । क्वचित्कार्यविशेषे तस्याव्ययत्वमिष्यते, क्वचिच्च न । तदिदं क्षण्यं भाष्यवार्तिकयोः सम्यगुपपादितं पश्यामः । तदेवात्र निबन्धे सप्रमाणं परीक्षितुं गमहे ।

तत्र तावदव्ययं नाम किमिति विमृशाम । अव्ययमित्येषापि महती संज्ञा ।
द्वितीयमपि संज्ञा प्राचीनैर्वैयकरणैरुक्ता अन्वर्था चेति तर्क्यामः । भाष्यकारस्तु

2. महाभाष्ये 2.1.11, पृ. 83. श्रीराजस्थान-संस्कृत-कालेज-ग्रन्थमाला, 1939

3. महाभाष्ये 2.1.5 पृ. 78.

श्रुतिवाक्यं प्रमाणमुदाहृत्य यत्र व्येति तदव्ययमिति निर्वचनं दर्शयति विकाररहितं शब्द-
स्वरूपमव्ययमित्याधुनिका अपि संमन्यन्ते । केपुचित् शब्देषु लिङ्गं संख्यां कारकं
कालं पुरुषभेदं विध्यादिकमर्थभेदं वाऽऽश्रित्य लोपागमादेशप्रत्ययादिरूपा विकारा
उपजायन्ते । ते हि विकारिणः शब्दा उच्यन्ते । केचिदुनः शब्दाः सर्वत्र
एकरूपाः । लिङ्गादिकृतविकाररहिता एव प्रयुज्यन्ते । एते अविकारिणः शब्दा
अव्ययानीति निर्दिश्यन्ते । भाषान्तरेष्वपि वैयाकरणा ईदृशं व्यपदेशमाद्विद्यन्ते ।
अस्मिन् विषये पाणिनिः किं वक्तीति पश्येम ।

पाणिनि स्तावत् 'खरादिनिपातमव्ययम्' (1-1-37) इति सूत्रेण खरादिगण-
पठितानां निपातानां चाव्ययत्वमाह । खरादिगणे बहवः शब्दाः पठ्यन्ते । आकृति-
गणोऽयम् । तेन गणे अपठिता अप्येवंजातीयका बहवः शब्दाः सन्तीति विज्ञायते ।
तेषामव्ययत्वं प्रयोगादवसीयते । ते चास्मिन् गणे उपसंख्येया इति फलति । के ते
शब्दाः कति चेति विशिष्य निर्देष्टुं न शक्यन्ते । चादयो निपाता उच्यन्ते ।
'चादयोऽसत्वे', 'प्रादयः' (1-4-57, 58) इति सूत्राभ्यामेषां निपातसंज्ञा विधीयते ।
चादिषु बहवः शब्दा उपलभ्यन्ते । पाणिनीये गणपाठे बहवः पाठभेदाः प्रक्षेपाश्च
सन्तीति विमर्शका विद्वांसो मन्यन्ते । किं तु चादिग्याकृतिगण एवेति हेतोरत्र
प्रक्षेपे पाठान्तरे वा सत्यपि न कश्चिद्वाच्यः । प्रादयस्तु द्वाविंशतिः परिगणिता एव ।
एते क्रियायोगे गतिसंज्ञामुपसर्गसंज्ञां च लभन्ते । 'उपसर्गाः क्रियायोगे', 'गतिश्च'
(1-4-59, 60) इति सूत्राभ्यां विधानात् । 'आकडारादेका संज्ञा' (1-4-1) इति
स्थितेऽप्येकसंज्ञाधिकारे, गतिश्चेत्यत्र चकारस्य संज्ञाद्वयसमावेशार्थत्वात् यौगपच्येन
प्रादीनामुभे संज्ञे भवत इति शास्त्रविदः । अधिरीश्वरे इत्यन्तैः सूत्रैरुक्ताः शब्दा
निपाता भवन्तीति प्रागावेदयाम । ते चैते सर्वे निपाता अव्ययसंज्ञां लभन्ते ।

'तद्धितश्चासर्वविभक्तिः' (1-1-38) इति सूत्रेण केषांचित् तद्धितान्ताना-
मव्ययत्वं विधीयते । अत्र 'परिगणनं कर्तव्यम् । तसिलादयः प्राक् पाशपः ।
शस्त्रभृतयः प्राक् समासान्तेभ्यः । अम् । आम् । कृत्वोर्थाः । तसिंवती ।
नानाभौ' इति परिगणनात् केषांचिदेव उक्तप्रत्ययान्तानां प्रातिपदिकानामव्ययत्वं
सिध्यति । पचतिकल्पमित्यादीनां तु न भवतीति कौमुद्यां स्पष्टम् । एतानि
तद्धितान्तानि अव्ययानि ।

कानिचित् कृदन्तान्यपि अव्ययानि भाषायां दृश्यन्ते । तदाह सूत्रकारः —
'कृन्मे जन्तः' (1-1-39) इति । कृत् यो मकारान्त एजन्तश्च, तदन्तमव्ययं

स्यादित्यर्थः । स्मारं स्मारं जीवसे पिवधयै इत्यादीनि उदाहरणानि । अन्यान्यपि कृदन्तानि कानिचिदव्ययानि भवन्ति । 'क्त्वा तो सुन् कसुनः' (1-1-40) इति सूत्रान्तरेण एतेषां संग्रहात् कृत्वा उदेतोः विसृपः इत्यादीनि उदाहरणानि ।

एतैः सूत्रैः केचिदप्रत्ययान्ताः शब्दाः, केचित्तद्धितान्ताः, केचिच्च कृदन्ताः अव्ययसंज्ञां प्रापिता इति स्थितम् । एषां सर्वेषामव्ययानामविकारित्वमेकरूपत्वं वा निर्विवादम् । न ह्येतेषां लिङ्गादिकृतः कश्चिद्विकारः कुत्रचिदुपलभ्यते ।

अव्ययीभावस्तु एभ्यो भिद्यते । अपदिशम्, अपदिशेन, अपदिशात्, अपदिशो इत्यादौ विकारदर्शनात् । अन्यानि अव्ययानि नैवं विकारं लभन्ते ; तेषां कारकयोगाभावात् । नापि तेषां लिङ्गभेदो भवति ; अलिङ्गमव्ययमिति संप्रतिपन्नत्वात् । अव्ययीभावस्तु नपुंसकलिङ्गो भवतीति सूत्रकारः स्वयं शास्ति — 'अव्ययीभावश्च' (2-4-18) इति । इदं च नपुंसकत्वमावश्यकम् । दीर्घान्तानां प्रातिपदिकानामव्ययीभावे उत्तरपदानां सतां ह्रस्वान्तत्वदर्शनात् । गोपायति गाः पातीति वा गोपधाः । तस्मिन्नित्यधिगोपम् । सप्तम्यर्थे 'अव्ययं विभक्ती' त्यव्ययीभावः । अत्रोत्तरपदे गोपाशब्दे ह्रस्वः श्रूयते । तेन दीर्घश्च ह्रस्वादेशो विधेयः । स च नपुंसकत्वे सति सिध्यति । 'ह्रस्वो नपुंसके प्रातिपदिकस्य' (1-2-47) इति सूत्रात् । तस्मादव्ययीभावस्य नपुंसकत्वं सूत्रकारो विधत्ते । एवं लिङ्गकारकयोगादव्ययान्तरेभ्योऽस्य विशेषः स्पष्टः ।

'अव्ययादाप् सुप्' (2-4-82) इति पाणिनि रव्ययाद्विहितस्य आपः सुपश्च लुक् विदधाति । अत्र वार्तिककार आक्षिपति — 'अव्ययादापो लुग्वचनानर्थक्यं लिङ्गाभावात्' इति । भाष्यकारश्चेदं व्याचष्टे — "अव्ययादापो लुग्वचनमनर्थकम् । किं कारणम् ? लिङ्गाभावात् । अलिङ्गमव्ययम् । किमिदं भवान् सुपो लुक् मृष्यति ; आपो लुक् न मृष्यति ? यथैव हि अलिङ्गमव्ययम्, एवमसंख्यमपि । सत्यमेतत् । प्रत्ययलक्षणमाचर्यः प्रार्थयमानः सुगो लुक् मृष्यति, आपः पुनरस्य लुकि सति न किञ्चिदपि प्रयोजनमस्ति । उच्यमानेऽप्येतस्मिन् स्वाद्युत्पत्तिर्न प्राप्नोति । किं कारणम् ? एकत्वादीनामभावात् । एकत्वादिव्यर्थेषु स्वादयो विधीयन्ते । न चैषामेकत्वादयः सन्ति । अविशेषेण उत्पद्यन्ते, उत्पन्नानां नियमः क्रियते । अथ वा प्रकृतानर्थानपेक्ष्य नियमः क्रियते । के च प्रकृताः ? एकत्वादयः । एकस्मिन्नेव एकरचनम् न द्वयोर्न बहुषु । द्वयोरेव द्विवचनं नैकस्मिन् न बहुषु । बहुष्वेव

बहुवचनं ; नैकस्मिन् न द्वयोरिति । अथवा आचार्यप्रवृत्तिर्जापयति — ‘उत्तद्यन्तेऽव्ययेभ्यः स्वादयः’ इति । यदयं ‘अव्ययादाप्सुः’ इति लुक् शास्ति⁴ इति ।

अव्यये तावदलिङ्गमसंख्यं चेति भाष्यकारः स्वयमभ्युपैति । लिङ्गाभावदेव स्त्रीत्वविवक्षाया असंभवात् स्त्रीप्रत्यय आप् नोत्पद्यते । तस्मादापो लुग्विधानं व्यर्थमिति वार्तिककारेणोक्तं भाष्यकारोऽपि निर्विवादं स्वाकरोति । पाणिनिना केनाभिप्रायेण आपो लुगुक्त इति चिन्तयन्तोऽपि तत्त्वं न बुध्यामहे । यदि मूत्रकारः अययानां लिङ्गयोगोऽप्यस्तीति मन्यते तर्हि केवलमावग्रहणं कुतः करोति ? डीप् डीष् डीनां प्राप्तिर्नास्तीति किमसौ मन्यते ? यदि अव्ययेष्वपि लिङ्गयोग इष्यते तर्हि स्त्रीप्रत्ययप्रकरणे, ‘नाव्ययात्, अव्ययात् न कश्चित् स्त्रीप्रत्ययः स्यात्’ इति वक्तव्यं स्यात् । लिङ्गयोगो नास्तीति चेत्, आपो लुग्विधानं सर्वथा निरर्थकमेव । आप इव अन्येषां स्त्रीप्रत्ययानां लुक् कुतो नोक्त इति शङ्कापि जागर्ति । न चाव्ययी-भावादापः प्रसक्तिः शङ्कनीया ; तस्य नपुंसकत्वविधानात् ।

भाष्यकारस्तु, आवग्रहणं प्रत्याख्याय सुवग्रहणस्य किं प्रयोजनमिति विचारयति । प्रत्ययलक्षणमाचार्यः प्रार्थयते । तस्मात् सुगे लुक् शास्तीत्याह । अस्म्येदं तात्पर्यम्, अव्ययानि तावत्पदानीति वैयाकरणाः स्वीकुर्वन्ति । पदानामेव प्रयोगार्हत्वं स्मरणात् ‘अपदं न प्रयुंजीत’ । इति निषेधात् । ‘न केवला प्रकृतिः प्रयोक्तव्या नापि प्रत्ययः’ न च प्रातिपदिकं धातुं वा प्रत्ययरहितं प्रयुज्यते । ‘सुप् तिङन्तं पदम्’ (1-4-14) इति परिभाषितान्येव पदानि प्रयोगार्हत्वं लभन्ते । ‘स्वादिष्वसर्वनामस्थाने’ (1-4-16) इति विहिता पदसंज्ञा तु न प्रयोगार्हत्वं साधयति । राजभ्यां राजभिरित्यादौ ‘न लोपः प्रातिपदिकान्तस्य’ (8-2-7) इति न लोपो भवति । अत्र राजन्निति नकारान्तस्य प्रातिपदिकस्यैव पदत्वात् । त्रिद्विभ्यामित्यादौ भ्यामादौ प्रत्यये परे ‘विद्वस्’ इति सकारान्तस्य प्रातिपदिकस्य पदत्वात् दत्त्वं मिध्यति । मरुद्विभ्यामित्यादौ प्रातिपदिकान्तस्थस्य तकारस्य दकारादेशोऽपि पदान्तत्वादेवेति स्पष्टम् । एवमनेककार्यार्था एषा पदसंज्ञा पाणिनिना विहितापि प्रातिपदिकमात्रस्य प्रयोगार्हत्वं संपादयितुं नेष्टे । अव्ययानि तु पृथक् प्रयुज्यन्ते तस्मात्तेषां पदत्वमावश्यकम् । तदर्थं सुन्तत्त्वं तावद्वक्तव्यमेव । अव्ययात् सुप् तु न श्रूयते । तस्मादिमानि राजा, वारि, वाक् इत्यादीनीव लुक्प्रविभक्तिकानि पदानि वक्तव्यम् । तस्मात्पदसंपत्तये सुपो लुग्विधानं मृष्यते ।

एवं सुपो लुग्विधानस्य प्रयोजनमुक्त्वा भाष्यकारः पुनः शङ्कते कथं नाम सुप् प्रवर्ततेति । सुपि हि द्वितीयादयो विभक्तयः कर्मादिष्वर्थविशेषेषु विधीयन्ते. 'कर्मणि-द्वितीया', 'कर्तृकरणयोस्तृतीया' इत्यादिना । अथवा 'अन्तरान्तरेण युक्ते', 'नमः स्वस्ति स्वाहा स्वधालं वषडयोगाच्च' इत्यादिसूत्रैः पदान्तरयोगं निमित्तमाश्रित्य द्वितीयादयो विधीयन्ते । अत एव कारकविभक्तिरूपद्विविधमिति द्वैविध्यमाहुः । षष्ठी तु संबन्धार्थे भवति । तदासां विभक्तीनामव्ययेषु प्रसक्तिरेव नास्ति ; अव्ययस्य अकारकत्वात् । शब्दशक्तिस्वाभाव्यादव्ययानां लिङ्गसंख्याकारकयोगो नास्तीति सिद्धान्तात् । तस्मादुच्यमानेऽपि लुकि कथं सुप् प्राप्नोतीति शङ्का तावदुत्तिष्ठति ।

तत्र यथाकथंचित् सुबन्तत्वसंपादनाय भाष्यकारः, संख्याया अभावेऽपि, एकवचनमुत्सर्गः करिष्यते इत्याह । इदं च संख्याविवक्षाभावेऽपि उत्पद्यमानमौत्सर्गिकमेकवचनं प्रथमाया एव भवितुमर्हति प्रातिपदिकार्थमात्रे तस्या एव विधानात् । द्वितीयादीनां प्राप्तौ हि संख्याभावेऽप्येकवचनमौत्सर्गिकत्वादित्युच्येत । एवं च प्रथमैकवचनमात्रे प्राप्ते तस्य लुकि सति 'अव्ययादाप् सुप्' इति प्रत्याहारग्रहणं व्यर्थमिति शङ्का तदवस्थानुवर्तते । अतो भाष्यकारेण प्रकृतानर्थानपेक्ष्य नियमः क्रियते इति पक्षान्तरमुपादायि । तथा च असत्यामपि संख्यायामविशेषेण विभक्तय उत्पद्यन्ते । तेन सुब्रिति प्रत्याहारग्रहणं सार्थकमिति भाष्यकारस्याशयो व्यज्यते ।

'स्त्रौजसमौट्' इत्यादिसूत्रे प्रत्ययाः एकविंशतिः संगृहीताः । तेषां प्रत्ययानां विभागः 'सुप्' इति सूत्रेण क्रियते । 'बहुषु बहुवचनं', 'कर्मणि द्वितीया' इत्यादीनि च सूत्राणि संख्या कारकादि रूपमर्थविशेषं बोधयन्ति । एषां सर्वेषां सूत्राणामेकवाक्यत्वं समुदितार्थबोधकत्वं परस्परापेक्षत्वं च केचिदिच्छन्ति । तथा च 'कर्मणि द्वितीया' इत्यायमर्थः — अनभिहिते कर्मणि एकत्वे द्वितीयैकवचनं अस्मिन् स्याद् इत्यादिः । अस्मिन्पक्षे अन्येभ्यः सुबुत्तिर्न प्राप्नोति । 'स्त्रौजसमौट्' इति सूत्रेणैवार्थविशेषमनपेक्ष्य सर्वे प्रत्यया विधीयन्ते इति, संख्यायामसत्यामपि त्रीणि वचनानि भवन्त्येव, एकत्वे एवैकवचनं न द्वित्वे नापि बहुत्वे इति संख्यान्तरे एकवचनस्य निषेधे तात्पर्यादिति द्वावपीमौ पक्षौ न संयुक्तौ । सर्वेभ्यः प्रातिपदिकेभ्यः सर्वत्र सर्वप्रत्ययोत्पत्तिप्रसङ्गात् । राम इत्येकत्वेऽपि तस्याविवक्षायां वचनान्तरप्रयोगस्य साधुत्वं स्यात् । तस्मात्संख्याकारकादि विशेषेषु प्रत्ययान्तरनिवारणाय एकवाक्यत्वमङ्गीकर्तव्यमापतति । अस्मादेवास्वरसात् भाष्यकारः पक्षान्तरमुपन्यस्यति 'ज्ञापकात्सुबुत्तिरिति । सुप् एवाभावे कस्य लुग् विधीयते ? प्रत्ययलोपो हि लुक् । लोपश्च प्रसक्तस्यैव ।

‘अदर्शनं लोप’ इति सूत्रे प्रसक्तस्यादर्शमिति व्याख्यानात् । अन्यथा रामशब्दे ककारादीनामदर्शनात् तेषां लोप इति व्यवहारः प्रसज्येत । सूत्रकारश्च लुक् शास्ति । तस्मादेव ज्ञापकात् सुप् उत्पत्तिरनुमीयते । इदमपि समाधानं नातीव रोचते । किमेतस्य ज्ञापने प्रयोजनमिति शङ्कायास्तदवस्थत्वाद् । पदत्वार्थं सुबन्तत्वमपेक्ष्यत इति चेत् तावत् निमित्तनिरपेक्षेण प्रथमैकवचनेनैव सिद्धमिति किं प्रत्याहारग्रहणेन ?

किं च सुतिङन्तमेव पदं, नान्यदिति कुतोऽयमाग्रहः ? ‘सुप् तिङन्तं पदम्’, ‘अव्ययं च’ इति पठित्वा अव्ययस्य सुबन्तत्वाभावेऽपि अव्ययत्वादेव पदत्वं भवतीति विधीयताम् । तावता इष्टसिद्धौ किमनेन लुग्निधानेन, तस्माच्च ज्ञापकात्सुबुत्पत्तिरिति कथंचित्समर्थनेनच ?

पाणिनिरत्र सुपो लुक् विदधानः अव्ययीभावं मनस्यकरोदिति तर्कयामः । अव्ययीभावे कारकयोगः संभवतीति स एव सूचयति, यदाह — ‘नाव्ययीभावादतो त्वपञ्चम्याः’, ‘तृतीया सप्तम्योर्बहुलम्’ (2-4-83, 84) इति । अत् इति ह्रस्वाकारो गृह्यते । अव्ययीभावस्य नपुंसकत्वात् ह्रस्वो नपुंसके प्रातिपदिकस्येति ह्रस्वादे शस्या-परिहार्यत्वात् दीर्घप्लुतान्तस्यासंभवात् तपरकरणं स्पष्टार्थमेव । अकारान्तादव्ययी-भावात् सुपो न लुक् । इदं प्रथमं वाक्यम् । तस्य सुपः स्थाने ‘अम्’ स्यात्पञ्चमीं विना । इदं द्वितीयं वाक्यम् । तृतीयासप्तम्योस्तु बहुलम् स्यात् । इदं तृतीयं वाक्यम् । ‘दिशोर्मध्ये’ इत्यर्थेऽप्यव्ययीभावः । तत्र पञ्चम्यां लुक् नास्ति, अमपि नास्ति । तथा च ‘अपदिशात्’ इति रूपं निष्पद्यते । ‘पञ्चम्यास्तु अपदिशा-दित्युदाहार्य’ मिति तत्त्वबोधिनी । विभक्त्यन्तराणाममादेशे ‘अपदिशम्’ इति मकारान्तं रूपम् । ‘क्लृबाव्ययं त्वपदिशं दिशोर्मध्ये त्रिदिक् स्त्रियाम्’ इत्यमरकोशः । बहुलग्रहणं तु विकल्पार्थम् । तथा हि —

‘कचित्प्रवृत्तिः कचिदल्पवृत्तिः

कचिद्विभाषा कचिदन्यदेव ।

विधेर्विधानं बहुधा समीक्ष्य

चतुर्विधं बाहुल्यं वदन्ति ॥’

इत्याहुः । तस्मात्तृतीयासप्तम्योरपि ‘अपदिशम्’ इत्येकं रूपम् । पक्षे ‘अपदिशेन, अपदिशे’ इतिरूपे भवतः । एते च कौमुद्यामुदाहृते । एवमव्ययीभावे कारकयोगः संभवतीति सूत्रकारोक्ति प्रामाण्यादवसीयते ।

अविधायके मूत्रे अपञ्चम्या इति निषेधात् 'आपाटलीपुत्रं वृष्टं देवः' इत्यत्र पञ्चम्या अस् न प्राप्नोति । पञ्चमी चात्र आङ्गोरे विहिता । अस् शिष्टप्रयोग-दृष्टत्वादिष्यते । तदाह वार्तिककारः — 'अमि पञ्चमीप्रतिषेधेऽपादानग्रहणम् इति । एतच्च भाष्यकारो व्याचष्टे — "अमि पञ्चमीप्रतिषेधेऽपादानग्रहणं कर्तव्यम् । किं प्रयोजनम् ? कर्मप्रवचनीययुक्तेऽप्रतिषेधार्थम् ।" कर्मप्रवचनीययुक्ते मा भूत् — आपाटलिपुत्रं वृष्टं देवः । न वा उत्तरपदस्य कर्मप्रवचनीययोगात् समासात् पञ्चम्यभावः । न वा वक्तव्यम् । किं कारणम् ? उत्तरपदमत्र कर्मप्रवचनीययुक्तम् । उत्तरपदस्य कर्मप्रवचनीययोगात् समासात्पञ्चमी न भविष्यति । यदा च समासः कर्मप्रवचनीययुक्तो भवति तदा प्रतिषेधः । तद्यथा — आ उपकुम्भात्, आ उपमणिकादिति ।" 5

एतेन अव्ययीभावात् पञ्चम्या अमादेशो नास्ति ; तस्या लुगपि नास्ति, किं तु अदन्तत्वात् 'टाड.सिङ्ग.सामिनात् स्याः' इति आदादेशे उपकुम्भादित्यादीनि रूपाणि भवन्तीति भाष्यवार्तिकयोरुक्तत्वात्, तावपि महर्षी सूत्रकारमनुसरत इति स्पष्टं भवति ।

'तृतीयासप्तम्योर्बहुलम्' इति मूत्रेऽपि, "सप्तम्या ऋद्धिनदीसमाससंख्या वयवेभ्यो नित्यम्" इति वार्तिककारो बाहुलकसिद्धमर्थं प्रपञ्चयति । भाष्य-कारोऽपि, सप्तम्या ऋद्धिनदीसमाससंख्यावयवेभ्यो नित्यमिति वक्तव्यम् । सुमद्रं, सुमगधम् । उन्मत्तगङ्गं, लोहितगङ्गम् । एकविंशतिभारद्वाजं, त्रिपञ्चाशद्द्रौतमम्" 6 इति उदाहरति । बहुलग्रहणलब्धश्चायमर्थो दर्शित इति कैयटः । 'अव्ययादाप् सुप्' इति सूत्रे 'अत्र पक्षत्रयेऽपि सप्तानामपि विभक्तीनामुत्पत्तिरिति बोध्यम्' इति उच्योते नागेशोऽप्याह । एवमेते अव्ययीभावे कर्मादिकारकयोगं तद्धेतुकविभक्ति-संबन्धं च निर्विवाद मभ्युपगच्छन्तीति स्पष्टम् ।

अयं लुको निषेधोऽभावश्चेति द्वयमपि अकारान्तेऽव्ययीभावे एव संभवति । अन्यत्र पुनरव्ययीभावात्कारकयोगे विभक्तौ सत्यां सा श्रूयेत । तस्या लुक् वक्तव्य एव । अत एव 'अव्ययादाप् सुप्' इति प्रत्याहारग्रहणं पाणिनिरकार्षीदिति ज्ञायते । 'स्वरादिनिपात मव्ययम्' इत्यादिभिः सूत्रैः परिभाषितानामव्ययान्तराणां कारकयोगा-भावात्, असंख्यमव्ययमिति भाष्यकारेण खयमुक्तत्वाच्च, तेभ्यः औत्सर्गिकं प्रथमैक-वचनमेव प्राप्नोतीति सुग्रहणेनैव तेषां पदत्वसंपत्तावपि, अधिहरीत्यादावव्ययीभावे

5. महाभाष्ये, 2.4.83, पृ. 383.

6. ibid.

विभक्तिलोपार्थमत्र प्रत्याहार ग्रहणस्यावश्यकत्वात् । एवमव्ययीभावस्य लिङ्गकारकयुक्तत्वं सूत्रवार्तिकभाष्येषु प्रतिपादितं मुनित्रयप्रामाण्याद् दुरपलपं प्रामाणिकैः स्वीकरणीयं चेति फलति । तथाच सति किमव्ययीभावस्य अव्ययत्वं प्रामाणिकं न वेति शङ्का उत्पद्यते । एषा च शङ्का प्रकारान्तरेण भाष्यकारेणोत्थापिता दृश्यते ।

तथाहि 'अव्ययीभावश्च' इति अव्ययसंज्ञाविधायके सूत्रे अव्ययीभावस्याव्ययत्वे प्रयोजनं 'लुङ्मुखस्वरोपचाराः' इति वार्तिकमवतार्य भाष्यकारो विचारयति ।

'अव्ययीभावस्याव्ययत्वे प्रयोजनम् । किम् ? लुङ्मुखस्वरोपचाराः । लुक् , उपाप्ति, प्रत्यप्ति । अव्ययादिति लुकसिद्धो भवति । मुखस्वरः - उपाप्तिमुखः, प्रत्यप्तिमुखः । 'नाव्ययदिक्शब्दगोमहत्स्थूलमुष्टिपृथुवत्सेभ्यः' इति एष प्रतिषेधः सिद्धो भवति । उपचारः - उपपयःकारः, उपपयःकामः इति । अतः 'कृकामिकंसकुम्भपात्र-कुशाकर्णोष्णव्ययस्य' इति प्रतिषेधः सिद्धो भवति । किं पुनरिदं परिगणनमाहोस्वि-तुदाहरणमात्रम् ? परिगणनमित्याह । अपि खल्वाहुः - 'यदन्यदव्ययीभावस्य अव्ययकृतं प्राप्नोति तस्य प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः' इति ।

अस्यार्थः - अव्ययीभावस्य अव्ययत्वे त्रीणि प्रयोजनानि वार्तिककारो गणयति । प्रथमं प्रयोजनं सुपो लुक् । 'अव्ययादाप् सुप' इति हि विधीयमानो लुक् अव्ययसंज्ञां विना न स्यात् । द्वितीयं प्रयोजनं मुखस्वरः । षष्ठाध्याये 'मुखं स्वाङ्गम्' (6-2-167) इति सूत्रेणोदात्तो विधीयते । स्वाङ्गवाचकं मुखमुत्तरपदमन्तोदात्तं भवति बहुव्रीहविति सूत्रार्थः । गौरमुखः अत्रोत्तरपदस्य मुखशब्दस्य स्वाङ्गवाचकत्वा-दन्तोदात्तत्वम् । 'स्वाङ्गः किम् ? दीर्घमुत्वा शाला' इति कौमुदीप्रत्युदाहरण (पृ. 567) दर्शयति । अत्र शालायामन्यपदार्थे मुखस्य स्वाङ्गवाचकत्वाभावात् नान्तोदात्तत्वमिति तात्पर्यम् । 'नाव्ययदिक्शब्द' - (6-2-168) इत्यादिनास्य प्रतिषेधं शास्ति । अव्ययात्परं मुखमन्तोदात्तं न स्यात् । उच्चैर्मुखः । अत्र 'बहुव्रीहौ प्रकृत्या पूर्वपदम्' इति । पूर्वपदप्रकृतिखरेण पूर्वपदस्यान्तोदात्तत्वमिति तत्त्व-बोधिण्यां स्पष्टम् । उपाप्तिमुख इत्यादौ अव्ययीभावपूर्वपदघटिते बहुव्रीहावपि एष प्रतिषेध इष्यते । अव्ययीभावस्यानव्ययत्वे तु न सिध्यति । तस्मादव्ययसंज्ञाया इदं द्वितीयं प्रयोजनमिति वार्तिककारो मन्यते ।

उपचारस्तृतीयं प्रयोजनम् । विसर्गस्थानिकं सकारमुपचार इत्याहुः । अयस्कारः, अयस्काम इत्यादौ 'अतः कृकामि' (8-3-46) इत्यादिना विसर्गस्य स्थाने सकारो

विधीयते । 'अकारादुत्तरस्यानव्ययस्य विमर्गस्य सामाने नित्यं मकारादेशः न्यात् करोत्यादिषु परेषु, न तूत्तरपदस्थस्य' इति कौमुदी (पृ. 19) व्याचष्टे । 'नित्यं पमासेऽनुत्तरपदस्थस्य' (8-3-45) इति पूर्वसूत्रस्यात्रानुवृत्तमर्थो लभ्यते । अनव्ययस्येति प्रतिषेधात् स्वःकाम इत्यादौ सत्त्वं न भवति । न्वःशब्दस्य न्वगदित्वेनाव्ययत्वात् । एवमेव उपपयःकारः उपपयःकाम इत्यादावव्ययीभावस्यापि विमर्गस्य करोत्यादिषु परेषु सत्त्वं नेप्यते । प्रतिषेधश्चाव्ययसंज्ञां विना न प्राप्नोति । तस्मादयं सत्त्वप्रतिषेधस्तृतीयं प्रयोजनमिति वार्तिककागे दर्शयति । एवं किमेतानि प्रयोजनानि उदाहरणतया दर्शितानि । सन्ति चान्यान्यपि अनुक्तानि प्रयोजनानि, आहोस्वित् किमेतानि त्राण्येव प्रयोजनानि न किंचिदन्यदिति परिगणनमत्राभिप्रेतमिति पृष्ट्वा, भाष्यकारः प्रयोजनान्तराभावादिवं परिगणनमिति स्वमतं प्रकाशयति । न केवलं मयोजनान्तराभावमात्रम् । किं तु अन्यत्राव्ययीभावस्याव्ययत्वे दोषाः स्युरिति अव्ययत्वप्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः । लुकि मुखस्वरे उपचारे च अव्ययत्वमन्यत्र तु नेति विशिष्य वक्तव्य मित्यर्थः । एवमनुक्त्वा सामान्यरूपेणाव्ययत्वं भवतीति विधीयमाने दोषाः प्रसज्यन्ते । तान् दोषान् भाष्यकारो विवृणुते —

'यदन्यदव्ययीभावस्य अव्ययकृतं प्राप्नोति तस्य प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः । किं पुनस्तत् ?

(1) पराङ्गवद्भावः । पराङ्गवद्भावे अव्ययप्रतिषेधश्चादितः, अच्चैर्धीयानवनीचैर्धीयानेत्येवमर्थम् । स इहापि प्राप्नोति — उपाग्न्यधीयान, प्रत्यग्न्यधीयान ।

(2) अकचि अव्ययग्रहणं क्रियते, उच्चकैर्नीचकैरित्येवमर्थम् । तदिहापि प्राप्नोति — उपाग्निकं प्रत्यग्निकम् ।

(3) मुमि अव्ययप्रतिषेधः चोद्यते — दोषामन्यमहः, दिवामन्या रात्रिरित्येवमर्थम् । स इहापि प्राप्नोति — उपकुम्भमन्यः, उपमणिकमन्य इति ।

(4) अस्य च्चौ अव्ययप्रतिषेध उच्यते दोषाभूतमहः, दिवाभूता रात्रिरित्येवमर्थम् । स इहापि प्राप्नोति — उपकुम्भीभूतम्, उपमणिकीभूतम् इति⁸ । एवं भाष्यकारेण चत्वारो दोषा दर्शिताः ।

पराङ्गवद्भावस्येदं विधायकं सूत्रम् — 'सुवामन्त्रिते पराङ्गवत्स्वरे (2-1-2) इति 'सामन्त्रित' (2.3.48) मिति सूत्रेण संबोधनप्रथमान्तमेव आमन्त्रितमिति परिभाष्यते

सुबन्तमामन्त्रिते परे पराङ्गवत्स्यात् स्वरे कर्तव्ये । द्रवत्पाणी शुभस्पती । इदमुदाहरणं दत्त्वा कौमुदी व्याचष्टे — ‘शुभ इति शुभेः क्विबन्तात् षष्ठ्यन्तस्य परशरीरानुप्रवेशे षाष्टिकमन्त्रिताद्युदात्तत्वम् । न चाष्टमिको निघातः शङ्क्यः । पूर्वामन्त्रितस्याविद्यमानत्वेन पादादित्वात् । यत्ते दिवो दुहितर्मतं भोजनम् । इह दिवःशब्दस्याष्टमिको निघातः’ इति (पृ. 529) । परस्य आमन्त्रितस्य अङ्गं पराङ्गम् ; सुबन्तमप्यामन्त्रितैकदेशतया गृह्यत इति यावत् । तेन ‘पती’ इत्यस्य संबोधनप्रथमाद्विचिन्नान्तस्यामन्त्रितत्वात्, शुभः इति षष्ठ्यन्तस्य तदङ्गवत्त्वे ‘आमन्त्रितस्य च’ (6-1-198) इति षाष्ठेन सूत्रेणाद्युदात्तत्वं सिध्यतीत्यर्थः । किं तु अष्टमाध्याये ‘आमन्त्रितस्य च’ (8-1-19) इति सूत्रेण पदात्परस्य अपादादौ स्थितस्य आमन्त्रितस्य सर्वस्यानुदात्तो विधीयते । ‘पदस्य’, ‘पदात्’, ‘अनुदात्तं सर्वमपादादौ’ (8-1-16, 17, 18) इत्यधिकारात् । अयं च षाष्ठस्यापवादः । ‘इमं मे गङ्गे यमुने सरस्वती’ त्यत्र मेशब्दात्परत्वात् गङ्गे इत्यादीनां त्रयाणामामन्त्रितानां सर्वानुदात्तत्वं भवति । तेनैव सूत्रेण प्रकृतेऽपि षाष्ठमाद्युदात्तत्वं कुतो न बाध्यत इति शङ्काया मुक्तम् — ‘आमन्त्रितं पूर्वमविद्यमानवत्’ इति सूत्रेण द्रवत्पाणी इत्यस्यामन्त्रितस्याविद्यमानत्वात् पादादित्वात् आष्टमिकमनुदात्तत्वमत्र न प्रवर्तत इति । अयं च पराङ्गवद्भावोऽव्ययानां नेष्यते । तदुक्तमस्मिन् सूत्रे वार्तिककारेण — ‘अव्ययप्रतिषेधश्च’ इति । उच्चैरधीयान, नीचैरधीयान । पराङ्गवद्भावे सति आद्युदात्तत्वं स्यात् । एते अव्यये स्वरादिष्वन्तोदात्ते पठिते इति कैयटः । नागेशस्तु ‘एवं चानेनैव स्वरेणानयोरवस्थितिः, आभ्यां परस्याष्टमिकनिघातश्चेति भावः । फिट्स्वरेण प्रत्ययस्वरेण वा अन्तोदात्तत्वसिद्धेः स्वरादिष्वन्तोदात्तपाठः किमर्थं इति चिन्त्यम्’⁹ इत्याह । स्वरादिष्वन्तोदात्तपाठो वा भवतु ; फिषोऽन्त उदात्त इति वाऽन्तोदात्तत्वं भवतु ; फले तु न कश्चिद् विशेषः । अनयोरन्तोदात्तत्वात्, ‘अनुदात्तं पदमेकवर्जम्’ इति आदेरनुदात्तत्वं सिध्यति । एवमव्ययप्रतिषेधे आरभ्यमाणे उपान्यधीयानेत्यादौ अव्ययीभावस्याप्यव्ययत्वात् पराङ्गवद्भावो न प्राप्नोति । तथा च ‘अनव्ययीभावस्य’ इति वचनान्तरमारभ्यते । अनव्ययीभावस्य अव्ययस्य प्रतिषेध इति तात्पर्यम् । तथा च कैयटः — ‘प्रतिषेधप्रतिषेधाद्विधिर्भवति एतच्च लुङ्मुखस्वरोपचाराः प्रयोजनमित्येतदनपेक्ष्योक्तं भाष्यकारेण । अन्यथा कार्यान्तरेऽव्ययत्वाभावादवक्तव्यमेतत्स्यात्’¹⁰ इति । अव्ययत्वे सति पराङ्गवद्भावस्य प्रतिप्रसवार्थं वचनारम्भः कर्तव्य इत्येष एव दोषो भाष्यकारेण प्रदर्शितः । तस्मान्न पूर्वापरविरोधः ।

9. उद्योते, 2.1.2, पृ. 68.

10. प्रदीपे, 2.1.2, पृ. 68

अकच् तद्धितः स्वार्थे विधीयते । 'अव्ययसर्वनामकच् प्राक् टेः' (5-3-71) इति । प्रत्ययत्वात् 'परश्च' इति प्राप्ते वचनसामर्थ्यात् टेः प्राग् भवति । उच्चकैः । नीचकैः । अयमकच् अव्ययत्वाविशेषात् अव्ययीभावादपि प्राप्नोति । न पुनरिष्यते । उपाधिक, प्रत्ययिकम् । अत्र कप्रत्यये कृते, अव्ययीभावस्यादन्तत्वात् ततः सुपो न लुक् किं तु अमादेशः । अव्ययत्वे सति, एतद्रूपं न मिध्यति । एष द्वितीयो दोषः ।

दोषामन्यमहः, दिवामन्या रात्रिरित्यादौ 'अरुद्विषदजन्तस्य मुम्' (6-3-67) इति प्राप्तो मुम् न भवति । अनव्ययस्येति प्रतिषेधात् । तथा हि — 'खित्यनव्ययस्य' (6-3-66) इति सूत्रेण खिदन्ते परेऽनव्ययस्य पूर्वपदस्य द्वयो विधीयते । शुनीं धयतीति शुनिंधयः । ह्रस्वे कृते ततो मुम् । तेनानेन मूलेण कृते ह्रस्वे सत्येव मुम् भवति ; नान्यत्र । तथोक्तं तत्त्वबोधिनीयम् — 'वर्णग्रहणे तदन्तविधेः सिद्धावप्यन्तग्रहणं शुनिंधय इत्यादौ ह्रस्वे कृते मुम्प्रवृत्त्यर्थम् । तथा हि अन्तशब्दः समीपपरः । अच्चासावन्तश्चेति विग्रहः । निपातनाद्विशेषणस्य परनिपातः । समीपः 'खित्यनव्ययस्येति विहितो योऽच् तदन्तस्य मुमिति व्याख्यायते' इति । एष ह्रस्वो मुम् च दोषादिवाशब्दयोरपि प्राप्तौ । अनव्ययस्येति निषेधान्न भवतः । किं तु उपकुम्भमन्य इत्यादौ अव्ययीभावस्य मुम् भवत्येव । तदर्थं 'अव्ययीभावस्याजन्तस्य मुम् स्याद्' इति वचनमारम्भणीयं स्यात् । अयं तृतीयो दोषः ।

अभूततद्भावे चिर्विधीयते । तस्मिंश्च सति 'अस्य च्वाः' (7-4-32) इति मूलेण अकारस्य ईकारो विधीयते । अकृष्णः कृष्णः संपद्यते तं करोति कृष्णीकरोति । अत्र वार्तिकम् — 'अव्ययस्य च्वावात्वं नेति वाच्यम्' इति । दोषाभूतमहः, दिवा-भूता रात्रिः । दोषादिवाशब्दयोरव्ययत्वादाकारस्य ईकारो न भवति । एतच्च 'अव्ययीभावश्चेति सूत्रे भाष्ये उक्तम्' इति कौमुदी (पृ. 324) । उपकुम्भीभूतमित्यादौ तु अव्ययीभावस्य च्वावात्वं भवत्येव । अव्ययत्वात्तत्रापि प्रतिषेधः प्रसज्येत । तेन ईत्वविधौ 'अव्ययीभावस्य तु भवतीति वचनं पृथगारब्धव्यम् स्यात् । एष चतुर्थो दोषः ।

एवं दोषानुदाहृत्य भाष्यकारः, तस्मादन्यत्वाव्ययत्वं नास्तीति वक्तव्यमिति स्वमतं स्थापयित्वा, वार्तिककारेणोक्तानां लयाणां प्रयोजनानां परिगणनरूपत्वात्, 'एषु कार्येष्वेवाव्ययत्वं, नान्यत्वेति लभ्यते' इति मतं दर्शयति । तदेवं प्रकारान्तरेणाव्ययीभावस्य अव्ययत्वमस्ति न वेति शङ्कामुपस्थापयति ।

अव्ययीभावस्याव्ययत्वे यानि त्रीणि प्रयोजनान्युक्तानि, तेष्वपि शङ्कामवतारयन्, अस्याव्ययसंज्ञा मा भूदित्याह — ‘यदि परिगणनं क्रियते नार्थोऽव्ययीभावस्याव्ययसंज्ञया । कथं यानि अव्ययीभावस्याव्ययत्वे प्रयोजनानि ? नैतानि सन्ति । यतावदुच्यते लुगिति । आचार्यप्रवृत्तिर्ज्ञापयति ‘भवति अव्ययीभावात् लुक्’ इति, यदयं ‘नाव्ययीभावादतः’ इति प्रतिषेधं शास्ति । उपचार इति । अनुत्तरपदस्थस्येति वर्तते । तत्र मुखस्वर एकः प्रयोजयति । न चैकं प्रयोजनं योगारम्भं प्रयोजयति । यद्येतावत् प्रयोजनं स्यात्तत्तैत्रायं ब्रूयात् — ‘नाव्ययादव्ययीभावाच्च’¹² इति । एतेन अव्ययीभावस्याव्ययत्वं तद्विधायकं सूत्रं च भगवान् भाष्यकारः प्रत्याचष्टे । अव्ययत्वे प्रयोजनाभावात् प्रत्युत दोषदर्शनात्, तत्र वक्तव्यमिति तात्पर्यम् । ‘अदन्तादव्ययीभावात्सुपो न लुक्’ इति निषेधादेव ज्ञापकादन्यत्र अव्ययीभावात्सुपो लुक् सिध्यति । अप्राप्ते निषेधस्य वैयर्थ्यात् । उपपत्त्यकार इत्यादावव्ययीभावे यो विमर्गः तस्योत्तरपदस्थत्वादेव सत्त्वं न भवति । परमयशःकाम इत्यादौ सत्त्वनिषेधार्थमनुत्तरपदस्थस्येति वक्तव्यमेव । तेनैवात्रापि सत्त्वनिषेधस्सिद्धः । समासस्य चरमावयवमुत्तरपदं वदन्ति । अव्ययीभावे चाल पयश्शब्द उत्तरपदम् । तस्मात्सत्त्वनिषेधार्थमव्ययसंज्ञा नापेक्ष्यते । मुखस्वरनिषेधार्थं तु अव्ययत्वमपेक्षणीयं स्यात् । यद्येतदेकमेव प्रयोजनमस्ति, तर्हि तन्मात्रलाभायेदं सूत्रं न कर्तव्यम् । नाव्ययेत्यादौ स्वरप्रतिषेधसूत्रे एव, अव्ययीभावाच्चेति पृथगुच्यताम् । न चैवं — ‘अव्ययीभावश्च’ इत्येतस्य प्रत्याख्यानं किं लाघवमिति शङ्कनीयम् । उक्तानां चतुर्णां दोषाणां पृथक् प्रयत्नं विनैव परिहारेण महतो लाघवात् । तस्मादिदं सूत्रं मा भूदिति भाष्यकारो मन्यते ।

अव्ययीभावात् सुपो लुक् न सार्वत्रिकः । क्वचित्तु कारकयोगोऽपि दृश्यते । नपुंसकत्वं च सूत्रकारेण विशिष्योक्तम् । तस्मादस्याव्ययत्वं नास्तीत्येव सुष्ठु प्रतिभाति । लिङ्गकारकयोगोऽपीदमव्ययमित्याग्रहे स्वीकृते, भाष्यकारोक्तेः शूद्राहरणेषु अव्ययत्वप्रतिषेधस्यापि वक्तव्यतया, क्वचिदव्ययं भवति क्वचित् नेति अर्धजरतीयन्यायापत्तेः । अव्ययत्वाभावे कथं लुक् सिध्येदिति न चोद्यम् । क्वचित् लुको दृष्टत्वात् लक्ष्यानुसारेण वचनारम्भस्य अवर्जनीयत्वात्, ज्ञापकानाश्रयणोऽपि ‘अव्ययीभावात्सुपः, नातः, अन्त्वपञ्चम्याः’ इति न्यासे गौरवस्यादोषत्वाच्च । ‘अव्ययीभावात्सुपः’ इति विधौ सुब्रह्मणस्य चरितार्थत्वात्, ‘अव्ययाच्च’ इत्यत्र तस्यानुवृत्तौ लाघवाच्च, सूत्रपाठ एवं

परिवर्तनीयः स्यात् — ‘अव्ययीभावात् सुपः, नातः, अन्वपञ्चम्याः, तृतीया-
मसम्योर्बहुलम्, अव्ययाच्च’ इति । यद्वा, अव्ययात् सुपो लुक् मा भूत् । सुप्
नोत्पद्यत इत्येवास्तु । तथापि सुमिडन्तं पदमित्यतः परं ‘अव्ययं च’ इति पठित्वा
तस्यापि पदत्वं विधीयेत चेन्न दोष इति तर्कयामः । मह सुपेत्यादौ अव्ययस्यापि
ग्रहणार्थं तस्य सुबन्तत्वमावश्यकमिति चेदुत्सर्गतः सुर्भवतीति भाष्यकारेक्तिमुपजीव्या-
व्ययाच्चेति तस्य लुग्विधानं ज्यायः । म्यादेतत् । अव्ययीभावस्य तु अव्ययत्वं
नापेक्ष्यते ।

एवं सति समासप्रकरणे, अव्ययीभावशब्दस्यान्वर्थत्वप्रदर्शनं कथं संगच्छते ?
अनव्ययमव्ययं भवतीति व्युत्पत्तेः का गतिः ? अत्र संज्ञासूत्रं प्रत्याख्याय तत्रान्वर्थ-
संज्ञेति व्याचक्षाणस्य भाष्यकारस्योक्तौ पूर्वापरविरोधः कथं परिहरणीय इति शङ्का
जायते । अव्ययीभावस्य लिङ्गसंख्याकाग्नयेनेऽपि वचनादव्ययत्वमिति वदन्ती
तत्त्वबोधिनी, शब्दानामव्ययत्वमनव्ययत्वं वा केवलं वचनादेव सिध्यतीति मन्यते ।
किं तु वचनमपि प्रयोगपरम्परानुविधायित्वादेव प्रामाण्यं भजते, नान्यथा । शिष्ट-
व्यवहारस्यैव नियामकत्वात् । तथा च भाष्यकारः — “कथं पुनर्ज्ञायते सिद्धः
शब्दोऽर्थः संबन्धश्चेति ? लोकतः । यत् लोके अर्थमर्थमुपादाय शब्दान्प्रयुञ्जते,
नैषां निर्वृत्तौ यत्नं कुर्वन्ति । ये पुनः कार्याभावाः नर्वृत्तौ तावत्तेषां यत्नः क्रियते ।
तद्यथा — घटेन कार्यं करिष्यन् कुम्भकारकुलं गत्वाऽह — ऽकुरु घटं, कार्यमनेन
करिष्यामीति । न तद्वत् शब्दान् प्रयुयुक्षमाणो वैयाकरणकुलं गत्वाऽह — ‘कुरु
शब्दान्, प्रयोक्ष्ये’ इति । तावत्येवार्थमुपादाय शब्दान्, प्रयुञ्जते,”¹³ इति
शब्दानां नित्यत्वमनादि प्रयोगपरम्परासिद्धत्वाददर्शयति । प्रयोगानुसारित्वादेव व्याकर-
णस्य ‘न बहुव्रीहौ’ (1-1-28) इति सूत्रं भाष्यकारः प्रत्याचष्ट । बहुव्रीहौ सर्वनाम-
संज्ञानिषेधार्थमिदं सूत्रम् । सत्यां संज्ञायामकच् प्राप्नोति, अन्यथा तु कः ।
कश्चेदानीं काकचोर्विशेष इति पृष्ट्वा, व्यञ्जनान्तेषु विशेषः । अहकं पिता यस्य
मकत्पितृकः, त्वकं पिता यस्य त्वकत्पितृक इति प्राप्नोति । मत्कपितृकः, त्वकपितृकः
इति चेप्यते ।” (पृ. 335) इति भाष्यकारः स्वयं विशेषं प्रतिपादयति । किं तु
मकत्पितृकः, त्वकत्पितृक इत्येव शिष्टैः प्रयुज्यते । तस्मादेते रूपे प्रामाणिके एव ।
त्वत्कपितृको मत्कपितृक इति रूपे तु प्रयोगाननुगृहीतत्वात् न शास्त्रेणान्वाख्येये ।
तस्मादकृचि इष्टापत्तिं कृत्वा भगवान् सूत्रं प्रत्याचरव्यौ — ‘गोनर्दीय आह, अकच्स्वरौ

तु कर्तव्यो प्रत्यङ्गं मुक्तसंशयो । त्वकत्पितृको मकत्पितृक इत्येव भवितव्यम्' इति ।
 अत्र कैयटः — 'मूत्रप्रत्याख्यानमेतत् । यथात्तरं हि मुनित्रयस्य प्रामाण्यम्' इति ।
 यथात्तरमिति प्रतीकमुपादाय नागेशोऽपि पतञ्जलेः प्रामाण्ये हेतुं दर्शयति —
 "उत्तरोत्तरस्य ब्रह्मलक्ष्यदर्शित्वात् । स्पष्टं चेदं 'धिन्विकृण्वोरच' इति सूत्रे भाष्ये" ¹⁴
 इति । एवं व्याकरणस्य शिष्टप्रयोगानुवर्तित्वं स्पष्टमुक्तम् । 'दीधीवेवीटाम्' इति
 सूत्रे 1-1-6 वार्तिककारोऽपि, दीधीवेव्योश्छन्दोविषयत्वात् दृष्टानुविधित्वाच्च छन्द-
 सश्छन्दस्यदीधे ददीधयुरिति च गुणदर्शनादप्रतिषेधः' इति प्रयोगमेव प्रमाणमुदाहरन्
 सूत्रकारमतं निराकरोति । दीधीवेव्योर्धात्वोर्गुणवृद्धी न स्त इति सूत्रकारो निषेधमा-
 रभते । आदीध्यनमावेव्यनमित्यत्र ल्युटि गुणः प्राप्तः तस्य आर्धधातुकत्वात्
 'सार्वधातुकार्धधातुकयोः' — इति इगन्तस्याङ्गस्य गुणविधानात् । आदीध्यक
 आवेव्यक इत्यत्र ण्वुलि तस्य णित्वाद् 'अचोऽङ्गिति' इति वृद्धिः प्राप्ता । तयोर्निषेधा-
 येदं मूलम् । वार्तिककारस्तु, उभयोरप्यनयोर्धात्वोश्छन्दस्येव प्रयोगात्, छन्दमि च
 सर्वे विधयो विकल्प्यन्त इति दृष्टानुविधानात्, अयं निषेधो व्यर्थ इति मन्यते । न
 केवलं व्यर्थ एव, किं तु कचिद्गुणस्यापि दृश्यमानत्वात् प्रयोगविरुद्धत्वादप्रामाणिकोऽर्पा-
 त्याह । प्रजापतिर्वै यत्किंचन मनसा दीधेत् होत्राय वृतः कृपयन्नदीधेत्, अदीधयुर्दाश-
 राज्ञे वृतासः इति छन्दसि गुणयुक्तान् प्रयोगान् भाष्यकार उदाहरति । तस्मादिदं
 मूलं भाष्ये प्रत्याख्यातम् । एवं शास्त्रस्य प्रयोगोपजीवित्वं भाष्यादिग्रन्थेषु बहुधा
 निदर्शयितुं शक्यते । प्रयोगशरणा वैयाकरणा इति रूढमूलः प्रवाद एतन्निमित्तक
 एव । तस्मादव्ययीभावस्य वचनादव्ययत्वमिति नेदं युक्तियुक्तमुत्पश्यामः ।

'तद्धितश्चासर्वविभक्तिः' (1-1-37) इति सूत्रे भाष्येऽयं विचारश्चाचितः ।
 तत्रत्यं ग्रन्थं नीचैरुपादन्नः —

'असर्वविभक्तावविभक्तिनिमित्तस्योपसंख्यानम्' । असर्वविभक्तावविभक्ति-
 निमित्तस्योपसंख्यानं कर्तव्यम् । विना, नाना । किं पुनः कारणं न सिध्यति ?
 'सर्वविभक्तिर्हि अविशेषात्' । सर्वविभक्तिर्हि एष भवति । किं कारणम् ?
 अविशेषेण विहितत्वात् । 'त्रलादीनां चोपसंख्यानम्' । त्रलादीनां चोपसंख्यानं
 कर्तव्यम् । तत्र यत्र, ततः यतः । ननु च विशेषेणैते विधीयन्ते 'पञ्चम्यास्तसिल्'
 'सप्तम्यास्त्रल्' इति । वक्ष्यत्येतत् — 'इतराभ्योऽपि दृश्यन्ते' इति यदि पुनर-
 विभक्तिश्शब्दोऽव्ययसंज्ञा भवतीत्युच्यते । 'अविभक्तावितरेतराश्रयत्वादप्रसिद्धिः' ।

अविभक्तौ इतरेतराश्रयत्वात् अप्रसिद्धिः संज्ञायाः । का इतरेतराश्रयता ? मति
अविभक्तित्वे संज्ञया भवितव्यम् । संज्ञया च अविभक्तित्वं भाव्यते, तदेतदितरेतराश्रयं
भवति । इतरेतराश्रयाणि च कार्याणि न प्रकल्पन्ते । 'अलिङ्गमसंख्यमिति वा' ।
अथवा अलिङ्गमसंख्यमव्ययसंज्ञं भवतीति वक्तव्यम् । एवमपीतरेतराश्रयमेव भवति ।
का इतरेतराश्रयता ? सत्यलिङ्गसंख्यत्वे संज्ञया भवितव्यम् । संज्ञया चालिङ्गसंख्यत्वं
भाव्यते, तदेतदितरेतराश्रयं भवति । इतरेतराश्रयाणि च कार्याणि न प्रकल्पन्ते । नेदं
वाचनिकम्, अलिङ्गता असंख्यता च । किं तर्हि ? स्वाभाविकमेतत् । तद्यथा समान-
मीहमानानां च अर्धायानानां च केचिदर्थैर्युज्यन्ते, अपरे न । तत्र किमस्माभिः कतु
शक्यम् ? स्वाभाविकमेतत् । सिद्धं तु पाठात् । पाठाद्वा सिद्धमेतत् । कथं पाठः कर्तव्यः ?
तसिलादयः 'प्राक् पाशपः । शस्त्रभृतयः प्राक् समामान्नेभ्यः । मान्तः । तसिर्वती ।
कृत्वोऽर्थः । नानाजौ' इति । अथवा पुनरस्तु 'अविभक्तिः शब्दोऽव्ययसंज्ञो भवती'
त्येव । ननु चोक्तम् — 'अविभक्तावितरेतराश्रयत्वादप्रसिद्धिः' इति । नैष दोषः । इदं
तावदयं प्रष्टव्यः — 'यद्यपि तावद्वैयाकरणा विभक्तिलोपमारभमाणा अविभक्तिकान्
शब्दान् प्रयुज्जते । ये त्वेते वैयाकरणेभ्योऽन्ये मनुष्याः कथं ते अविभक्तिकान्
शब्दान् प्रयुज्जते इति । अभिज्ञाश्च पुनर्लौकिका एकत्वादानामर्थानाम् । अतश्चा-
भिज्ञाः । अन्येन हि वस्तेनैकं गां क्रीणन्ति । अन्येन द्वौ । अन्येन त्रीन् ।
अभिज्ञाश्च न च प्रयुज्जते । तदेतदेवं सदृश्यताम् — अर्थरूपमेवैतदेवंजातीयकं येनात्र
विभक्तिर्न भवति इति । तच्चाप्येतदेवमनुगम्यमानं दृश्यताम् । किंचिदव्ययं विभक्त्यर्थ-
प्रधानं, किंचित् क्रियाप्रधानम् । उच्चैर्नीचैरिति विभक्त्यर्थप्रधानम्, हिरूक् पृथगिति
क्रियाप्रधानम् । तद्धितश्चापि कश्चित् विभक्त्यर्थप्रधानः, कश्चित्क्रियाप्रधानः । तत्र
यत्नेति विभक्त्यर्थप्रधानः । नानाविनेति क्रियाप्रधानः । न चैतयोरर्थयोर्लिङ्ग-
संख्याभ्यां योगोस्ति ।'¹⁵

एतेन महता ग्रन्थसन्दर्भेण भाष्यकारः, अव्ययत्वं शब्दानां स्वाभाविकं न
वाचनिकमिति सयुक्तिकं स्थापयति । अलिङ्गत्वमसंख्यत्वं च स्वाभाविकमेव । लिङ्ग-
व्यवस्थापि स्वाभाविकी प्रयोगमात्रगम्या, पाणिनिना सर्वेषां शब्दानां लिङ्गनियमस्या-
नुक्तत्वात् । तटं त्रिषु ; स्वशब्दो धनवाची पुंनपुंसकयोः ; आप इति स्त्रियाम् ;
द्वाराः पुंसि ; कलत्वं तु नपुंसके ; तथा दारा आप इति बहुत्वे एव अन्येवमादयो
विशेषाः सूत्रकारेणानुक्ता अपि प्रयोगादेवावगम्यन्ते । तदुक्तं भाष्यकारेण — 'लिङ्गम-
शिष्यं लोकाश्रयत्वात् लिङ्गस्य' इति । एवं चेदमलिङ्गासंख्यत्वरूपमव्ययत्वं स्वाभाव-

सिद्धमिति कथं वचनेन विधातुं शक्यते ? वचनमपि लोकसिद्धार्थानुवादकतयैव नेयं भवति । नस्मादव्ययीभावस्याव्ययीत्वमेव नोपपद्यते ।

किंचिदव्यये विभक्त्यर्थप्रधानम् । किंचित्तु क्रियाप्रधानमिति द्वैविध्यं भाष्यकारेणाच्यते । कैयटस्तु वैविध्यमुपपादयति —

‘अन्ये त्वाहुः । किंचिदव्ययं क्रियाप्रधानं, किंचित्साधन प्रधानम् । अन्यत्तु नापि क्रियाप्रधानं नापि साधनप्रधानं, यथा स्वः पश्य । लोहितगङ्गम्, उन्मत्तगङ्गदेशः’ इति । तथा चात्र नपुंसकत्वमव्ययीभावश्चेत्यन्वाख्यायते । पूर्वं च भाष्यकारेणाक्तम् — ‘स्वर्गदानां पुनः सत्ववचनानामसत्ववचनानां च’ इति । तस्माद्वाहुल्याभिप्रायेण अलिङ्गमसंख्यमव्ययमित्युच्यते¹⁶ इति । स्वः पश्येत्यत्र स्वःपदार्थस्य कर्मत्वं स्पष्टम् । अत्र कारकयोगोऽस्ति । तदाहनागेशः — ‘तादृशबहुमध्यपाठेन स्वर्गदानामपि अलिङ्गासंख्यत्वमनुमीयते । अनेककारकशक्ति योगमात्रेण तु सत्ववचनत्वमिति भावः । उन्मत्तगङ्गादानां तु वाचनिकमव्ययत्वमव्ययीभाव इति महासंज्ञया गृह्यते । सत्वप्रधानता तु ‘इदं स्व’रिति सर्वनाम्ना परामर्शाद्’ इति । कैयटेनैव पूर्वं वृद्धव्यवहारादेव शब्दार्थसंबन्धावगमादेकत्वादिव्यवहारवत् अलिङ्गताऽसंख्यत्वमप्यव्ययार्थस्य प्रसिद्धमित्यर्थः’ इति भाष्यतात्पर्यं व्याख्यातम् । तत्र नागेशेनापि ‘तथा च संख्याभावादेव विभक्त्यनुत्पत्तिरिति अविभक्तिरिति न्यासोऽपि अदुष्ट इति भावः । ‘अव्ययादाप सुप’ इति मूलं तु न्यायसिद्ध्या अनुत्पत्तेरेवान्वाख्यायकं, प्रत्ययलक्षणप्रवृत्तिद्वारा पदत्वसंपादनार्थमिति तात्पर्यम्¹⁷ इति स्पष्टीकृतम् । एवं स्थितेऽपि वाचनिकमव्ययत्वं कथमयं स्वीकरोतीति विस्मयामहे । लुगर्थमव्ययीभावस्याव्ययत्वमिष्यत इति चेत्, तदर्थमेव वचनमारभ्यताम्, मा भूदव्ययसंज्ञेति ब्रूमः । सुखस्वरोऽपि लोके न विशेषमापादयति : छन्दस्येव स्वरस्य विशेषावहत्वात् । तत्रापि नाव्ययादव्ययीभावाच्चेति वचनमेवास्तु । तथा चाव्ययीभावस्याव्ययत्वं न प्रामाणिकमित्येष एव श्लो भाष्यकारेणाहृत इति प्रतिभाति । महतीयं संज्ञा क्रियते, तस्मादन्वर्था वेज्ञायतामिति भाष्योक्तिस्तु पूर्वार्थमतानुवादेरूपाः स्वमतं तत्र सूत्रे प्रतिपादितमिति । विरोधः ।

16. भाष्यप्रदीपे, 1.1.87, पृ. 245.

17. प्रदीपोद्योते, पृ. 245.

18. *ibid* पृ. 244.

स्वः पश्य, इदं स्वः, स्वःपतिरित्यादौ स्वरित्यव्ययार्थे कारकसंबन्धो दृष्टः त्वथमस्याव्ययत्वमिति शङ्का स्यात् । विभक्त्यर्थप्रधानमिति भाष्यकारः कथयत्येव । इदं सत्त्ववाचीति कैयटः । भाष्यकारोऽपि 'स्वरादि निपातमव्ययम्' इति (१-१-३६) त्वे चादीनां निपातानामव्ययत्वार्थं निपातग्रहणस्यापेक्षितत्वात्, स्वरादीनां चादिषु पाठेषामपि निपातत्वेनैव अव्ययत्वसिद्धेः किं पृथक् स्वरादिगणपाठेन किं च सूत्रे स्वरादि हणेनेति शङ्कामवतार्य एवं समाधत्ते —

“किमर्थं पृथग्ग्रहणं स्वरादीनां क्रियते, न चादिष्वेव पठ्येरन् ? चादीनां वा सत्त्ववचनानां निपातसंज्ञा, स्वरादीनां पुनः सत्त्ववचनानामसत्त्ववचनानां च”^{१९} इति । तेन सत्त्ववाचिनामप्यव्ययत्वमस्तीति सिध्यति । 'त्वस्ति वाचयति, स्वः पश्येति । क्रयासंबन्धेऽनेकशक्तिदर्शनात् सत्त्ववाचित्वनिश्चयः, लाहितगङ्गमित्यानामव्ययानां त्वधर्मनपुंसकत्वदर्शनात् व्यक्तमेव सत्त्ववाचित्वम्' इति कैयटः । 'अनेक-गरकशक्तियोग एव सत्त्वमितिभावः' इति नागेशोऽपि व्याचष्टे । एवमव्ययानां त्ववाचित्वं केषांचित्प्रामाणिकमङ्गीकर्तव्यम् ।

किं तु सत्त्ववाचित्वेऽपि नैतेषां विभक्तिसंबन्धः । सत्यपि कारकशक्तियोगे, विभक्तिरिति न्यासेऽपि न दोष इत्यत्रोक्तरीत्या संख्याभावादेव विभक्तेरनुत्पत्तिरिति वीकारात् । एतच्च शब्दशक्तिस्वाभाव्यात् । तथा च स्वरादीनां सत्त्ववचनानामपि न शक्तिं विभक्त्यन्तत्वं पश्यामः । तस्मादव्ययीभावस्याव्ययत्वं नास्तीति दृढं प्रतिपद्यामहे ।

एवं तर्हि कथं सूत्रकारः संज्ञार्थं सूत्रमारभत इति चेत् श्रूयताम् । लक्ष्यैक-क्षुष्काः केचित्प्रयोगादेव किमव्ययं किं च नेति विनिगन्तुं प्रभवन्ति । प्रयोगानभिज्ञाः नक्षणैकचक्षुष्कास्तु तथा विवेक्तुं न शक्नुवन्तीति तेषामुद्धोधनाय सूत्रकारो महर्षि-चार्यः सुहृद्भूत्वान्वाचष्टे — 'इदमव्ययम् । अस्मात् सुपो लुक् । अव्ययीभावोऽपि मव्ययम् । अदन्तात् तस्मात्सुपो न लुक्' इत्यादि । एवं च लक्षणमात्रदर्शना-स्माकं कृते पाणिनिरिमं प्रयासं करोतीति न कश्चिद् विरोधः ।

अयमत्र संक्षेपः — अव्ययीभावस्य नपुंसकत्वं ह्रस्वान्तत्वसंपादनार्थमावश्यकम् । अपदिशमपदिशेनापदिशादित्यादिरूपाणां दर्शनादकारान्तादव्ययीभावात् सुपो लुक् नास्तीत्यपि वक्तव्यम् । पराङ्गवद्भावादिषु अव्ययत्वं नास्तीति प्रतिषेधोऽपि वक्तव्यः ।

एवं महता क्लेशेन कथंचिदव्ययत्वं समर्थनीयम् । लिङ्गकारकयोगे सत्यपि विभक्तौ श्रूयमाणायामपि वचनादव्ययत्वमिति विश्वमनीयम् । तस्मादस्याव्ययत्वं मा भूत् । मा च भूदन्वर्थत्वाभिमानः । सुपो लुक् तु विशिष्य विधीयताम् । एतेन सर्वेष्टसिद्धौ प्राचीनोक्तसंज्ञानुरोधमालेणास्याव्ययत्वं कथंचिद्वक्तव्यमित्याग्रहः परित्यज्यतामिति निवेदयामः ।

अव्ययीभावेऽपरोऽयं कश्चिद्विशेषः प्रस्तूयते । 'तत्र तेनेदमिति सरूपं' इति (2-2-27) बहुव्रीहिर्विधीयते । अस्यार्थः 'सप्तम्यन्ते ग्रहणविषये सरूपे पदे तृतीयान्ते च प्रहरणविषये इदं युद्धं प्रवृत्तमित्यर्थे समस्येते, कर्मव्यतिहारे द्योत्ये, स बहुव्रीहिः' । केशेषु केशेषु गृहीत्वा इदं युद्धं प्रवृत्तं केशाकेशि । दण्डैर्दण्डैश्च प्रहस्येदं युद्धं प्रवृत्तं दण्डादण्डि । अत्र कौमुदी—“इच् समासान्तो वक्ष्यते । तिष्ठद्-प्रभृतिषु इच्प्रत्ययस्य पाठादव्ययीभावत्वमव्ययत्वं च । 'अन्येषामपि दृश्यते' इति दीर्घः ” (पृ. 196) इति विशेषं स्पष्टयति । एवं बाहूबाहवि, मुष्टीमुष्टि इत्यादीन्यपि रूपाणि उदाहरति । 'तिष्ठद्प्रभृतीनि च' (2-1-17) इति सूत्रेण केचिच्छब्दा निपात्यन्ते । तथा च कौमुदी — 'एतानि निपात्यन्ते । तिष्ठन्त्यो गावो यस्मिन् काले स तिष्ठद्, दोहनकालः । आयतीगवम् । इह शत्रादेशः पुंवद्भावविरहः समासान्तश्च निपात्यते' इत्याह (पृ. 164) ।

अस्मिन् गणे पठितानां शब्दानामव्ययीभावाधिकारस्थितत्वादव्ययीभावत्वं तावन्निर्बाधम् । अस्य गणस्यान्ते 'इच् प्रत्ययः समासान्त' इति पठ्यते । 'इच् कर्मव्यतिहारे' (5-4-127) इति सूत्रेण इच् विधीयते । कर्मव्यतिहारे यो बहुव्रीहिः तस्मादिच् समासान्त इति कौमुदी । एवं 'द्विदण्ड्यादिभ्यश्च' 5-4-128, इति सूत्रेणापि इच् विधीयते । अत्र सूत्रे द्विदण्ड्यादिभ्य इति नेयं पञ्चमी, किं तु तादर्थ्ये चतुर्थी । तेन द्विदण्ड्यादीनामिजन्तानां रूपाणां सिद्धयेऽत्रापीज् भवतीत्युप-संख्यानमभिप्रेयते । इजन्तानां च तिष्ठद्प्रभृतित्वादव्ययीभावत्वं, तत एव हेतोरव्ययत्वं च भवति । एवं बहुव्रीहेरपि अव्ययीभावत्वं पश्यामः । तदाह तत्त्वबोधिनी — 'अत्राव्ययीभावसंज्ञया बहुव्रीहिसंज्ञा न बाध्यते, किं तु द्वयोः समावेश एव, उपजीव्य-विरोधस्यान्याग्यत्वात्' इति (पृ. 198) । एवं संज्ञाद्वयसमावेशस्येदं विचित्रमुदाहरणं पश्यामः । द्वौ दण्डौ यस्मिन् प्रहरणे तद् द्विदण्डि । एवं विग्रहवाक्यं प्रदर्श्य कौमुदी द्विदण्ड्यादीनामपि शब्दानां बहुव्रीहित्वं सूचयति । सत्यपि बहुव्रीहित्वे समासान्तस्येचः कारणादव्ययीभावत्वमपि संपद्यते ॥

पूर्वपदार्थप्रधानोऽव्ययीभाव इति तु प्रायोवाद् इति सिद्धान्तः । केशकेशी-
त्यादिषु उदाहरणेषु अन्यपदार्थप्रधान्यस्य स्पष्टत्वात् । तिष्ठद्बुप्रभृतीनां बहुव्रीहि
प्रकरणस्थत्वाभावेऽपि अन्यपदार्थप्रधानत्वं तावन्निर्विवादम् । 'संख्या वंशेन'
(2-1-19) इति विहितस्याव्ययीभावात्स्येदमुदाहरणम् । 'द्वौ मुनी वंश्या द्विमुनि ।
व्याकरणस्य त्रिमुनि । विद्यातद्वतानभेदविवक्षायां त्रिमुनि व्याकरणम्' ।²⁰ अयमुत्तर-
पदार्थप्रधानः । 'नदीभिश्च' (2-1-20) इति विहितोऽप्येवम् । समाहारे चाय-
मिष्यते । अयं नद्युत्तरपदोऽव्ययीभावः समाहार एवेत्यर्थः, चकारस्यात्र अवधार-
णार्थकत्वात् । समाहारस्य चान्यपदार्थत्वात्, एषोऽप्यव्ययीभावः न पूर्वपदार्थप्रधानः ।
उन्मत्तगङ्गं, लोहितगङ्गमित्यादौ तु 'अन्यपदार्थे च संज्ञायाम्' इति (2-1-21)
अव्ययीभावः । वाक्येन संज्ञानवगमात् अयं नित्यसमास इति कौमुदी । तस्य
चान्यपदार्थप्रधानत्वं सूत्रकारेण स्वयमुक्तम् ।

अव्ययीभावे प्रायेण पूर्वपदमव्ययं भवति । 'अव्ययं विभक्त्या'त्यादि 2-1-6
समासविधायकशास्त्रेषु अव्ययस्यैव प्रथमानिर्दिष्टत्वात् । प्रथमानिर्दिष्टं समास उपसर्जन-
मिति परिभाष्य, उपसर्जनं पूर्वमिति तस्य पूर्वनिपातविधानात् । किं तु 'सुप् प्रतिन
मात्रार्थे' (2-1-9) इति सूत्रे सुबतं प्रथमानिर्दिष्टम् । शाकस्य लेशः शाकप्रति
अयमव्ययान्तोऽव्ययीभावः । अत्र लेशरूपस्याव्ययार्थस्य प्रधानत्वादुत्तरपदार्थप्रधान्यं स्पष्टम्
एवमेव 'अक्षशलाकासंख्याः परिणा' (2-1-10) इति सूत्रेऽक्षादयःशब्दा एव
प्रथमानिर्दिष्टाः । तेन अक्षपरि, शलाकापरि, एकपरीत्यादौ तेषां पूर्वनिपातः सिध्यति
अव्ययान्तोऽयमव्ययीभावः । अस्यार्थः 'अक्षेण विपरीतं वृत्' मित्यादिः । द्यूतव्यवहारो
पराजय एवायं समास इति स्वीकरणात् । तस्मादस्याप्यव्ययीभावस्य उत्तरपदार्थप्रधानत्वं
दुर्वारम् । द्विमुनि, सप्तगङ्गं, लोहितगङ्गं, तिष्ठद्बु, केशकेशि इत्यादयोऽव्ययी
भावास्तु स्वयमव्ययरहिताः, अव्ययीभावत्वादेवाव्ययत्वं लभन्ते इति महद् वैचित्र्य
मुपलभामहे ॥

भारविप्रणीते किरातार्जुनीये कार्यावस्थायोजना

आचार्यैर्नाटकेषु पञ्चमन्धीनां तेषामङ्गनाञ्च निबन्धनमावश्यकं मतम् । एते सन्धयस्तेषामङ्गानि च नाट्यशास्त्रदशरूपकसाहित्यदर्पणप्रभृतिषु ग्रन्थेष्वतिविस्तरेणो-
ल्लिखितानि । महाकाव्यलक्षणे आचार्यैः स्पष्टं निर्दिष्टं यत् महाकाव्यमपि नाटकवत्
पञ्चसन्धिसमन्वितं भवेत् ।¹ अनेन स्पष्टमिदं यत् महाकाव्यसन्धियोजनायै नाटकसन्धि-
योजनानुल्यमेव महत्त्वं प्रदत्तम् । सन्धीनां सम्यक् सन्निबन्धनार्धमपेक्षितमिदं यन्नाटके
काव्ये वाधिकारिकप्रासङ्गिकवृत्तयोः, पञ्चार्थप्रकृतीनां, पञ्चकार्यावस्थानां चापि सम्यक्
योजना भवेत् ।

1. काव्यालङ्कारः (भामहप्रणीतः) —

सर्गबन्धो महाकाव्यं महतां च महच्च यत् ।

अग्राम्यशब्दमर्थ्यञ्च सालङ्कारं सदाश्रयम् ॥

मन्त्रदूतप्रयाणाजिनायकाभ्युदयैश्च यत् ।

पञ्चभिः सन्धिभिर्युक्तं नातिव्याख्येयमृद्धिमत् ॥ १.१९-२०

काव्यादर्शः — सर्गैरनतिविस्तीर्णैः श्रव्यवृत्तैः सुसन्धिभिः ।

सर्वत्र भिन्नवृत्तान्तैरुपेतं लोकरञ्जकम् ॥ १.१८-१९

काव्यालङ्कारः (रुद्रटप्रणीतः) —

सन्धीनपि संछिष्टांस्तेषामन्योन्यसम्बन्धात् । १६.१९

ध्वन्यालोकः — सन्धिसन्धयङ्गघटनं रसाभिव्यक्त्यपेक्षया ।

न तु केवलया शास्त्रस्थितिसम्पादनेच्छया ॥ ३.१२

साहित्यदर्पणः — शृङ्गारवीरशान्तानामेकोऽङ्गी रस इष्यते ।

अङ्गानि सर्वेऽपि रसाः सर्वे नाटकसन्धयः ॥ ६.३१७

महाकाव्यलक्षणे आचार्यैर्निर्दिष्टं यत् धर्मार्थकाममोक्षेष्वेकं महाकाव्यस्य फलं भवति । एतेष्वेकस्य द्वयोर्वा प्राप्तिर्नायकस्यार्भाष्टा भवति । यदा साधकः (नायकः) धर्मार्थकाममोक्षेष्वेकस्य द्वयोर्वा प्राप्त्यर्थं प्रयतते तदा तस्य सकृत् क्रियाकलापे एको निश्चितः क्रमो भवति । प्रथमं साधकः फलप्राप्तये दृढनिश्चयं करोति, यदा च तस्यां सौकर्येण साफल्यं न दृश्यते तदा सोऽतितीव्रगत्या प्रयासमारभते, मार्गे विघ्ना अप्या-
यन्ति, यतते स तान्प्रतिकर्तुम्, तस्मिन्समये साध्यसिद्धिः संदिग्धा जायते । शनैः शनैः विघ्ना नाशं गच्छन्ति, फलप्राप्तिश्च सुनिश्चिता भवति । अन्ते च सम्पूर्णं फलं प्राप्यते । अयमेव कार्यस्य अवस्थाया क्रमो भवति यः पञ्चभागेषु विभक्तः । तेषां नामानि सन्ति — आरम्भः, यत्नः, प्राप्याशा, नियताप्तिः, फलागमश्च ।³ एतासां पञ्चावस्थानां सम्यग् नियोजनं महाकाव्ये आवश्यकं मतम् । भारविप्रणीते किरातार्जुनीये महाकाव्ये एता अवस्था इत्थं नियोजिताः —

आरम्भः

मुख्यफलस्य प्राप्तये यत्र केवलमात्सुक्यमेव दृश्यते तत्रारम्भो भवति ।⁴ किरातार्जुनीये साध्यसिध्यर्थं साधके आत्सुक्यं तृतीयसर्गस्य चतुर्विंशे श्लोके दर्शितं यत्र वर्णनमस्ति — ‘शिष्यवदार्जुनः युधिष्ठिरस्य ‘गच्छ, तपश्चरतु’ आज्ञामिमां शिरो-
धार्यं विनम्रतया, विद्यामाहात्म्यं प्रकाशयतो महर्षेर्व्यासस्य समक्षमुपस्थितोऽभवत् ।’⁵ अर्जुनस्य व्यासं प्रति गमनं फललाभाय तस्योत्सुक्यं सूचयति । अतोऽत्र आरम्भ इति कार्यावस्थास्ति । काव्यस्य प्रथमे द्वितीये च सर्गे इदमेवोत्सुक्यं प्रस्तोतुमुपक्रमः कृतः । महर्षेर्व्यासस्यागमनं सहसैव न प्रस्तुतमपितु पूर्वं कविना वनेचरस्यागमनं, समाचारनिवेदनं, द्रौपद्या भीष्मस्य च क्रुद्धवचनानि, युधिष्ठिरेण सान्त्वनाप्रदानं च सन्निविष्टमनन्तरञ्च महर्षेर्व्यासस्यागमनं, पाण्डवैः तस्य स्वागतं, महर्षेः विद्यापदिष्टादीनि चापन्यस्तानि । एवं प्रथमसर्गादारभ्य तृतीयसर्गस्य एकोनत्रिंशं श्लोकं यावदारम्भावस्था प्राप्यते ।

साहित्यदर्पणः — चत्वारस्तस्य वर्गाः स्युस्तेष्वेकं च फलं भवेत् । ६.३१८

३. दशरूपकम् — अवस्थाः पञ्च कार्यस्य प्रारब्धस्य फलार्थिभिः ।

आरम्भयत्नप्राप्याशानियताप्तिफलागमाः ॥ १.१९

४. दशरूपकम् — आत्सुक्यमात्रमारम्भः फललाभाय भूयसे । १.२०

साहित्यदर्पणः—अत्रेदारम्भ आत्सुक्यं यन्मुख्यफलसिद्धये । ६.७१

५. किरातार्जुनीयम्—इत्युक्तवन्तं ब्रज साधयेति प्रमाणयन्वाक्यमजातशत्रोः ।

प्रसेदिवांसं तमुपाससाद वसन्निवन्ते विनयेन जिष्णुः ॥ ३.२४

यत्नः

फलस्याप्राप्तौ अतिवरायुक्तो व्यापारः प्रयत्न इत्यभिधीयते । दिव्याम्बराभ्यां यक्षेण सहार्जुनस्येन्द्रकीलप्रस्थानं, तत्तेन्द्रप्रसादनार्थं कठोरतपश्चरणं च मुख्यतत्त्वताभावात् । तस्य त्वरायुक्तो व्यापारः । अत एव तत्रास्ति यत्नाभिधाना कार्यावस्था । अन्येयं काव्यस्य तृतीयसर्गस्थानपष्ठिस्तोकादारभ्य षष्ठसर्गस्य अष्टविंशं श्लोकं चाहुपलभ्यते ।

प्राप्त्याशा

यत्र फलप्राप्तिरुपायानामुपायानां चाशङ्क्यावृता किन्तु प्राप्तेः सम्भावना भवेत्तत्र प्राप्त्याशा भवति ।^७ अवस्थेयं किरातार्जुनीये षष्ठसर्गस्यैकोनत्रिंशत्श्लोकादारभ्य एकादशं सर्गं यावत् प्राप्यते यातोऽत्र फलप्राप्तेराशा उपायानां विघ्नानां चाशङ्क्यावृतास्ति किन्त्वस्ति तत्र प्राप्तिरसम्भावना । अर्जुनस्य कठिनं तपो वाक्ष्येन्द्रकीलपवतस्य दनरक्षकाणामिन्द्रं प्रति गमने, अर्जुनतपोनिवेदने, अर्जुनस्य तपश्चर्यायां दिव्योपस्थापनयन्द्रेण गन्धर्वाणामप्सरसां च प्रेषणे, तेषां सविलासे गमने, विविधासु केलिषु, अर्जुनस्य प्रलोभनार्थं देवाङ्गनानामर्जुनं प्रति गमने, अर्जुनं वाक्ष्यतामां विविधासु चेष्टासु, तामां प्रयत्ननिष्फलतायाम्, इन्द्रस्यार्जुनाश्रमागमने, द्वयोः संवादे, अन्त इन्द्रेण प्रत्यर्क्षभूय शङ्कराराधनाय अर्जुनं प्रति समादेशे चास्ति प्राप्त्याशावस्था ।^८ अत्र फलप्राप्तेराशा उपायैरुपायैश्च वृतास्ति । उपरि परिगणितेषु विषयेषु आरम्भादारभ्य देवाङ्गनानां विविधाः चेष्टाः यावदुपायानाम् अन्येषु च विषयेषु उपायानां कथनमस्ति । इन्द्रस्य शिवाराधनार्थमर्जुनं प्रति प्रेरणं फलप्राप्तेः सम्भावनां दृढीकरोति ।

नियताप्तिः

विघ्नाभावतः यत्र फलप्राप्तिः पूर्णरूपेण निश्चिता जायते तत्र नियताप्तिर्भवति । किरातार्जुनीयस्य द्वादशसर्गादारभ्य अष्टादशसर्गस्वार्म्भं यावदियमवस्थोपलभ्यते शिवप्रसादनार्थमर्जुनस्य तपश्चरणे, अर्जुनतपोऽसहमानानां सिद्धतपविनां शिवं प्रति गत्वा

- | | | |
|--------------------|--|------|
| ६. दशरूपकम् | — प्रयत्नस्तु तदुपायौ व्यापारोऽनित्वगन्वितः । | १.२० |
| साहित्यदर्पणः | — प्रयत्नस्तु फलवाप्यौ व्यापारोऽनित्वगन्वितः । | ६.५२ |
| ७. दशरूपकम् | — उपायापायशङ्काभ्यां प्राप्त्याशा प्राप्तिर्भवति । | १.२१ |
| साहित्यदर्पणः | — उपायापायशङ्काभ्यां प्राप्त्याशा प्राप्तिर्भवति । | ६.५२ |
| ८. किरातार्जुनीयम् | — ६.२९-११.८१. | |
| ९. दशरूपकम् | — असायाभावतः प्राप्तिरनियताप्तिः सुनिश्चिता । | १.२१ |
| साहित्यदर्पणः | — असायाभावतः प्राप्तिरनियताप्तिस्तु निश्चिता । | ६.५३ |

अर्जुनतपोनिवेदने, शिवस्य तेभ्योऽर्जुनस्वरूपमुक्त्वा सान्त्वनाप्रदाने, अर्जुनं जेतुमागतं शूकरवेषधारिणं मूकदानवं हन्तुं किरातवेषधारिणः शिवस्य अर्जुनाश्रमे स्वसेनया सहा-गमने, अर्जुनैव दानवदर्शने, शिवार्जुनाभ्यां तस्मिन् कृते बाणप्रक्षेपे, दानवे पञ्चचङ्गं गते स्वगणमानेतुं शिवप्रेषितः य वनेचतून्त्यार्जुनं प्रति कटूक्तिप्रयोगे, शिवार्जुनयोः युद्धे, अन्तेऽर्जुनस्य पराक्रमं निभाल्य शिवस्य असत्रतयांचास्ति नियताप्त्यवस्था । अत्र पूर्वमपाया दर्शिता अनन्तरांचायाभूतः शिवस्य प्रसादः फलसिद्धेः निदर्शकः । अतोऽत्र नियताप्तिरस्ति ।

फलागमः

यत्र समग्रफलप्राप्तिः सञ्जायते तत्र फलयोगः फलागमो वा भवति ।¹⁰ किरातार्जुनीयस्याष्टादशसर्गस्य पञ्चदशश्लोकादारभ्य सर्गान्तं यावदियमवस्थास्ति । अर्जुनस्य पराक्रमं वीक्ष्य शिवस्य स्वास्तविकरूपधारणे, इन्द्रादीनां लोकपालानाम् अर्जुनसमक्षमागमने, अर्जुनकृतशिवस्तुतौ, वरयाचने, शिवेन पाशुपतास्त्रसहिते धनुर्वेदोपदेशे, पाकशासनप्रभृतिभिर्देवैः विविधास्त्रप्रदाने, अन्ते च कृतकृत्यस्यार्जुनस्य युधिष्ठिरं प्रति गमने प्रणामे चावश्यमुपलभ्यते यतोऽत्र नायकस्यार्जुनस्य समग्र-फलप्राप्तिरुक्ता ।

एवं किरातार्जुनीये महाकाव्ये कविना सर्वासामेव कार्यावस्थानां सुष्ठुरूपेण योजना कृता ॥

सन्दर्भ ग्रन्थ सूची

१. काव्यादर्शः (दण्डिप्रणीतः) - गवर्नमेंट् ओरियण्टल् सीरीज् ४, पूना, १९३८ ई०.
२. काव्यालङ्कारः (भामहप्रणीतः) - बिहारराष्ट्रभाषापरिषद्, पटना, १९६२ ई०.
३. काव्यालङ्कारः (रुद्रट्टप्रणीतः)-काव्यमाला २, निर्णयसरप्रैस, बम्बई, १९२८ ई०.
४. किरातार्जुनीयम् (भारविप्रणीतम्) - चौखम्बा संस्कृत सीरीज्, वाराणसी, १९६१ ई०.
५. दशरूपकम् (धनञ्जयप्रणीतम्) - चौखम्बा विशाभान, बनारस, १९५५ ई०.
६. ध्वन्यालोकः (आनन्दवर्धनप्रणीतः) - चौखम्बा संस्कृत सीरीज्, वाराणसी, १९४० ई०.
७. साहित्यदर्पणः (विश्वनाथप्रणीतः) - मोतीलाल बनारसीदास, दिल्ली, १९६१ ई०.

10. दशरूपकम् - समग्रफलसम्पत्तिः फलयोगो यथोदितः । ९.२२.

साहित्यदर्पणः - सावस्था फलयोगः स्याद्यः समग्रफलोदयः । ६.७३

SRI K.J. KRISHNAMOORTHY

రెడ్డిరాజుల సాంస్కృతిక మూర్తిమత్త్వము*

— ఒక చిత్రము.

వాక్కును దేవతగా భావించు భారతీయుల వైజ్ఞానిక ప్రస్థానమున వారి భాషకు విశిష్టమైన స్థానము కలదు. ఆనంతవిశ్వమున ఆభివ్యాప్తమైయున్న శబ్దమును బ్రహ్మముగా. అందుండి యభివ్యక్తమైన వాక్కును బ్రాహ్మిగా భారతీయాయు రారాధించి వ్యవహరించిరి. ఆర్యావర్త జనసంఘమున నట్లాదికాలమునుండియు వ్యవహృతమగుచుండిన భాషయే మహర్షి కల్పలగు మహనీయులచే సంస్కరింపబడి 'సంస్కృత' మై 'దైవీవాక్కు' గా. భారతీయ సంస్కృతికి మూలకందముగా తనరారినది.

సంస్కృతము నాగరకభాష (cultured languages) లన్నింటిలోను పురాతన మైనది; తలమానికమైనది. అది యిహపర సాధకమగు భారతీయ వైజ్ఞానిక సంపద నిశీప్తమై యున్న సువర్ణపేటిక. లోకమున ధార్మికమగు సంస్కృతీ సామ్రాజ్యమున నెలకొల్పబడ్డవారా భిన్నత్వములో నేకత్వమును సాధించుట కనువైన యమూల్య సాధనమది :

★ సంస్కృతసంబంధి యైనది సాంస్కృతికము. మూర్తిమత్త్వముగా వ్యక్తిత్వమని యర్థము. రెడ్డిరాజులయొక్క సంస్కృత వాఙ్మయ పరిపోషణ సరిణిలో సాహిత్య విభిన్న వారి విశిష్టధార్మికవ్యక్తిత్వమే వారి "సాంస్కృతిక మూర్తిమత్త్వము" (Literary Personality) గా నిచట నివ్వబడుచున్నది.

'సాంస్కృతి (Culture) కి సంబంధించినది సాంస్కృతికము' — అను పుష్పత్తియొక్క అంతర్గతము.

1. 'Justly it is called Sanskrit, i.e. 'perfect, finished' — Schlegel.
vide. అంధ్రప్రతాపరుద్రయశోభూషణము, P.13.

గీర్వాణమునకు గల ఈ గొప్పతనమును గురించి, యుద్ధానిని పెక్కురీతుల పెంపొందిజేసినవారలలో ఆంధ్రులది అగ్రతాంబూలము. సూత్రకర్తలలో సుగృహీతనామలైన బోధాయనాపస్తంబుల కాలము (క్రీ.పూ. ఏడవ శతాబ్దికి ముక్కిలి పూర్వము) నుండియే సంస్కృత వాఙ్మయమున నాంధ్రోపజ్ఞుమగు భాగము రూపొందియుండుట యిందులకొక నిదర్శనము. భాగోక్తి మైన యవికి కాలణముగా ఆంధ్రావని యతి ప్రాచీన కాలము నుండియు నార్యావర్త సాంస్కృతిక సంప్రదాయ సముదాయమును దక్షిణాపజ్ఞమున కందించు కూడలిగా అత్యధిక ప్రశస్తి నార్జించియున్నది.

ఏతదనుగుణముగా, ఆయాకాలములలో త్రిలింగ భూమిని పరిపాలించిన రాజన్య తెల్లరును తమ తమ యాస్థానములను 'సురభారతి'కి విహార సీమలుగా నొనర్చి తెలుగునాట దివ్యవాణిని తేజరిల్ల జేసిరి. అట్టివారిలో అత్యర్థేందుకుల ప్రసూతులు, అచ్చమగు నాంధ్రదేశీయతచే అలంకృతులు నగు కాకతీయులు ప్రథమ స్మరణీయులు. శాతవాహనులనాడంకురించిన యాంధ్రత్వభావనకు సుస్పష్టరేఖలతో విలసిల్లు సమగ్ర స్వరూపము నొసంగిన కీర్తి వీరలది :

ఈ కాకతీయ వంశము చాళుక్యసామ్రాజ్య కల్లోలముల యదనున, క్రీ.శ. పదునొండువ శతాబ్ది ప్రారంభకాలమున, నొక్కుమ్మడిగా స్వయంభూదేవునివలె నావిష్కరించి యధికారమును చేపట్టి, యావదాంధ్రదేశమున కేకచ్ఛత్రాధిపత్యము వహించి, వాఙ్మయ శిల్పాది వివిధ రంగములయందు నూతనాదర్శములను నెలకొల్పుచు దాదాపు మూడు శతాబ్దములు అనంతర కాలీన రాజవంశములకు మార్గదర్శకముగా నలరారినది.

సహృదయ శేఖరులై, స్వయముగా విద్వాంసులై, కవీశ్వరులై పరలిన కాకతీయ చక్రవర్తులు విద్యత్కవిపుంగవు లనేకులను సన్మానించి గీర్వాణ వాఙ్మయమును మూడు పూవు లాటు కాయలుగా వర్ణిల్లజేసిరి వీరి పరిపాలనలో శ్రౌత భాష్యములు, దర్శన వివరణములు, వివిధ శాస్త్ర గ్రంథములు, వ్యాఖ్యానములు, కావ్య నాటకములు, లఘుస్తోత్రములు మున్నగు ననేక ప్రక్రియలు అక్షరపరిపుష్టినొంది యలరినవి. వానిలో ప్రతాపరుద్రీయాదులు యావద్భారతీయ ప్రశస్తి ప్రాచుర్యముల నందియున్నవి.

కాకతీయులలో తొలుతటివాగు బేతరాజాదుల కాలమున జరిగిన సంస్కృత భాషా వాఙ్మయ ప్రచార పరిపోషణములను వారి శాసనముల మూలమున చక్కగా నూహింప గలము. రామేశ్వర దీక్షితు డా కాలమునందలి పండితలోకమున వినుతి తెక్కిన విద్యత్పల్లజాదు ఇతడు మొదటి ప్రోలరాజు మూరుడైన రెండవ బేతరాజు (క్రీ.శ. 1075-1110) నకు శిష్యుడై నొసంగి, యాతనిని పరమ మాహేశ్వరునిగా నొనర్చి, యతనిచే సర్వమాన్యముగా నొక యగ్రహారమును బడసెను. ఈదాన విషయము నభివర్ణించెడి ఖాజీపేట శాసన (క్రీ.శ. 1090) మందలి కవితాపాటవము గణనీయము. ఏతద్రచయిత మహాకవి దేవన భట్టు.

హనుమకొండ సహస్రస్థంభ విలసిత రుద్రేశ్వరాలయమున గల చక్రత్రాసీత శాసన (క్రీ.శ. 1163) రచయిత అచింతేంద్రదేవకవి. ఇతడు పై రాష్ట్రమున కీర్తిజుగ్మ పుత్రుడు; అద్వయమృతయతి శిష్యుడు. ఈ శాసన కావ్యములను రచించిన కవిని కవికా కౌశలమును బట్టి యీ కవీశ్వరుని యపూర్వ సారస్వత ప్రజ్ఞా వ్రాసినట్లు ప్రకటించుచున్నది. ఈ కవి కాశ్యపుడగు మొదటి ప్రతాపరుద్రుడు (క్రీ.శ. 1159-1173) సంస్కృతాంధ్ర కర్ణాటాది బహుభాషా కోవిదుడు, 'విద్వాత్సభాషణ' దీపికాచితు. రసికావంశమునైన యీ మహారాజుండెంతో కవులను, పండితులను, విశిష్టులను ఆదరించెను. ఈ రాజకవి సంస్కృతమున 'నీతిసార' మను గ్రంథమును రచించి 'వియమాషణ' డను పేరు వడసెను. బదైన తెనుగున రచించిన నీతిరాత్నముకావలె కీ నీతిసారము ముఖ్య ధారముని చెప్పబడినది.

రుద్రనరేశ్వరుని తమ్ముని తనయుడగు గణపతి దేవుడు (క్రీ.శ. 1196-1202) కాకతీయ రాజన్యులలో సకల విధముల నగ్రగణ్యుడు. అపత్ర పరాక్రముడైన ఈ యాంధ్రోర్వీకుని కాలముననే శ్రీశైలాది త్రిలింగములు కాకతీయ సీతాతటత్రావహాశాస్త్రి నందుకొనినవి. మహోన్నత కాకతీయ సామ్రాజ్య చిత్రాకావ్యాయుడైన తెలుగు జాతి యానాడు ఐకమత్యము గలిగి, వెలుగు జాతిగా పేర్చింపబడినది. ఆ యుగమున మనాటి యాంధ్రుల జీవన రంగము లన్నింటి వినుతా కాంతుల పరిజన్మించి.

గణపతిదేవుని వాఙ్మయాభిరతి కా యవనీశ్వరు దేవుడచిన్ విద్వామండల మొక యుత్తమ తార్కాణము. అది యానాడు గీర్వాణ వాఙ్మయ మహోన్నత రచించిన సుప్రసిద్ధ ప్రకాండలతో, ప్రతిభాగరియులగు ప్రౌఢకవీంద్రులతో హింపిరి వోపుచుండినది. విద్వామండలమునకు గణపతిశైలపాల చిన్మయ దీక్షగురుడగు విశ్వేశ్వరశిష్యాచార్యు డధ్యక్షుడు. ఈ మహారాజు మంత్రులలో నొకడైన శివదేవయ్య సంస్కృతాంధ్ర కవికా సీతామహారు : తమిళి గణసాధని జాయసేనాని విరచించిన 'నృత్తితావళి' ఆ శాస్త్రమున వెలసిన యమూల్య రచన. ఇందలి కొన్ని లక్షణములకు రామప్ప దేవాలయమండలి సత్తకీమణుల శిల్పములు లక్ష్యములని పరిశోధకుల నిశ్చితాభిప్రాయము. జాయసేనానికి రచించిన గీతి రత్నావళి, వాద్యరత్నావళి యను మఱిరెండు కృతులు నేడు మృగ్యములైనవి. వారిహరాయ్యుడు, సంది మిత్రుడు, బాలభారతి, కవిచక్రవర్తి, మయూరచక్రపాద్యాయుడు, సూర్యకాండేని లైనవా రానాటి శాసనముల వలన తెలిచువచ్చిన మఱికొందరు సంస్కృత మహాకవులు.

గణపతిదేవ చక్రవర్తి పుత్రిక చంద్రామి (క్రీ.శ. 1258-1295) మొట్ట మొదట సామంతుడు వ్రాయించిన కోటగిరి తామ్ర శాసనము (క్రీ.శ. 1273) నుండి యనేక సంస్కృత విద్వాంసుల పేర్లు వెల్లడియగుచున్నవి. అందు కొందఱు కవులై యుండుట, వారిలో తెలుగువారే గాక తమిళదేశీయులు నుండుట, వాఙ్మయ పోషణను నెడల ఆ మహారాజు రాజ్యమున వెల్లి విరిసియుండిన ఆదరదార్యములకు దృష్టాంతములు. అరణ్యమున ఈశ్వర

భట్టోపాధ్యాయుడు, అనంతసూరి మున్నగు శాసనకావ్యప్రణేత శ్రీ తెనుగురాణి పాలనలో వర్తిల్లిరి. కాకతీరుద్రుడు-I సంస్కృత వాఙ్మయాభివృద్ధి కేంద్రబింబం యంకురము ఇట్లు క్రమాభివృద్ధి నొందుచు రుద్రమ దౌహిత్రుడగు ద్వితీయ ప్రతాపరుద్రుని కాలము నాటికి కడుమనోహరముగ పుష్పించి ఫలస్మృతమై యుండినది.

ప్రతాపరుద్రదేవుడు కవులలో కవి, పండితులలో పండితుడు. ఆ బాల్యకవిత్వ రసజ్ఞుడైన ఈ చక్రవర్తి ఉషారాగోదయ, ప్రతాపమూర్తాండ, యయాతిచరిత్రాది గ్రంథములను, వ్యాకరణ వార్తికాది వ్యాఖ్యలను, మఱికొన్ని వివరణములను రచించి యుండినట్లు గ్రంథాంతరములందు పేర్కొనబడినది. కాని యవి యన్నియు నేడు మృగ్యములు. విద్యద్వోష్ఠి ప్రియుడైన ఈ మహారాజు నాస్థానము రెండువందలమంది విద్యన్మహాకవులతో కళకళలాడు చుండినది. వారందరిలోను విద్యాధినాథు డనబడిన విద్యానాథ మహాకవి ప్రథమ గణనీయుడు. ఈ కవి తల్లజుడు 'ప్రతాపరుద్రయశోభూషణ'మను తొమ్మిది ప్రకరణముల లక్షణగ్రంథమును రచించి సాహిత్య శాస్త్రమున 'యశోభూషణ' శాఖకు శ్రీకారము చుటైనను.

బాలభారతాది చతుస్సప్తతికావ్యప్రణేతయు, సారస్వతమృదేదియు నైన యగస్త్యుడు, అపరవాఙ్మనుడని కీర్తింపబడిన గంగాధరుడు, రూపక రచయితలు, శాసన కావ్యప్రణేతలు నగు విశ్వనాథ సరసింహకవులు. నాట్యశాస్త్రవేత్తయగు కవి భల్లటుడు, జైన కవియగు అప్పయ్యుడు, కవిలోకమల్లుడగు శాకల్యమల్లుభట్టు, శతావధాన చతురుడగు కొలచెలమ మల్లినాథ పండితుడు మున్నగు మహా విద్వాంసు లెందరో పీఠుర్రుదేవుని వితరణ వాహినీలో నోలలాడి యమరవాణిని కృతికుసుమములచే కైసేసిరి. వీరిలో అగస్త్య విద్యానాథ గంగాధరులు రుద్రాంబిక కాలము నుండియు కవిపుంగవులుగా ప్రసిద్ధి నొంది యున్నవారు.

కాకతీయుల సమాదరణమున వర్తిల్లిన సంస్కృత వాఙ్మయముయొక్క వైశిష్ట్యమును నిరూపించు సంశయములలో, అక్షరాంక గద్యాది విలక్షణ లఘుకృతులు, ఉదాహరణాది వినుల్చి కావ్యప్రక్రియలు, ప్రశస్తములగు శాసనకావ్యములు ఓక్కిలిగా వెలువడుట - యనునవి ప్రత్యేకముగ ప్రవచింప దగియున్నవి. ఇట్లు వైవిధ్యము, ప్రాచుర్యము గల పరశ్చత గ్రంథ జాలము పరిధి విల్లిన కళాసమన్వయసమన్విత కమనీయస్వర్ణయుగము కాకతీయ చక్రవర్తుల యుగము² :

2. రెడ్డి రాజులకు అనేక విషయములయందు దాదర్శనప్రాయములై వర్తించిన కాకతీయ ఖ్యాతాధుల పోషణమున వెలసిన సంస్కృత వాఙ్మయముయొక్క వికాసోదంతము, ఆ రెడ్డి రాజుల 'సాంస్కృతిక మూర్తిమత్త చిత్రణము'కు తిలకాయమానమగు సవతారికగా ఇంతవర కిట్లు సంగ్రహింపబడినది.

విధివై పరీత్యమవలన కాకతీయ సామ్రాజ్యభానుడు తనకు తురుష్కులకాకరాత్రిలో (క్రీ.శ. 1323) కనుమఱుగై పోవగా త్రిలింగ మండలము తీవ్ర సంక్షోభాంధకారావృత్తిమై తల్లడిల్లినది. కక్కనులవంటి యవనులవలన పీడింపబడిన తెనుగువ్రజల ధార్మికి జీవనము కార్పిచ్చు చుట్టుకొన్న కాననము వోలె కడుంగడు సంతపించి పోయినది. అట్టి విపత్సమ యమున హైందవ ధర్మోద్ధరణాభివృద్ధి న మునుసూరి ప్రోలయ నాయకుడను మహావీర పురుషుడు చెదరిపోయిన నాయకులను చేరదీసి, ప్రతాపరుద్రునిపై ప్రకాశక్తిని సంఘటిత పఱచి, తురుష్కువార్ధిమగ్నయైన తెనుగుభూమి నుద్ధరించెను. ఆ సమయమున నాతని నామము యవనులకు ఉచ్చాటనకర్మకారయగు మంత్రమాయెను. తెలుగువారి కాతడు మనువుగా, విష్ణ్వంశ సంభూతుడుగా గన్నట్లెను

అట్లు యవనులను పాఠద్రోలిన పిమ్మట ప్రోలమహిమతి, యపహృతములై యుండిన యగ్రహారాధికములను పునర్వత్తములు గావించియు, సత్పాత్రులైన పండితాఖండలు లకు సూతనముగ సనేకదానము లిచ్చియు, ఇప్పించియు, హిందూ ధర్మమునకు గుండెకాయ యైన సంస్కృతమునకు బలము చేకూర్చెను. ద్వారణ, జ్యోతిష, గణిత, మేమాంసాది వివిధ శాస్త్రములలో పారంగతులైన దెబ్బదియైన్నిదిమంది గీర్వాణ విద్వాంసుల కాతి దానంగిన 'వృత్తుల'ను విశదీకరించు 'విలస' కాననము ఇందుల కొక విమల దృష్టాంతము.

ప్రోలయ యనంతర మతని పినతండ్రి కుమారుడైన కావయనాయకుడు హైందిప ధర్మ పునరుజ్జీవనోద్యమమునకు నడుముకట్టి నాయకత్వము వహించి, తన సోదరుని సంకల్పమును సమగ్రముగా సాధించెను యవసభిజేత. ఆంధ్ర సురత్రాణుడు నైన కావయ నాయకేంద్రునియొక్క దోర్నిప్రకమము కారణముగా బంగారునగరమగు నేకశిలాపురిపై మరల నాంధ్ర పతాక మంబరచుండియై రెపరెప లాడెను. వాఙ్మయ పోషణమునను ప్రోలయ యడుగు జాడల ననుసరించిన కావయ, వేదివేదాంగ పారింగతులగు పండిత వరేణ్యుల నేకులను సమీకరించి వారల కగ్రహారాద్యనేక దానముల నవరింపఁజేయుగ గావించి గౌర వించెను.

ప్రోలయ వేమ భూపాలుడు (1324-1353)

హిందూ ధర్మ పునరుద్ధరణ మహాధ్వరమున మునుసూరి సోదరులకు బాసటయై ప్రకాశించిన పంచనవ్వుతి నాయకులలో పంజాన్వయ గ్రామణియైన ప్రోలయ వేమారెడ్డి

8. 'రెడ్డి' యను పదము 'తెలుగు-తనుగు' శబ్దముల కన్న మిన్నయైన పురాతన చరిత్రకలిది. ఈ పదముయొక్క పుట్టు పూర్వోత్పత్తి ముందు, వివరించామ వికాసములను గూర్చి పరిశోధకు లనేకులు కూరింపఁజముగ చచ్చించియున్నారు. సంగ్రహముగ తత్సారాశమిది: ఇది 'పట్ట + కుడు' యను రెండు శబ్దముల కలయికవలన నేర్పడిన

ప్రథమ గణ్యుడు. మైచ్చాద్ది కుంభోచ్చివుద్దె నెగడిన యీ ప్రోలయ వేముడు యవనసేనా నిరూపణానంతరము పూంగి నాటి యందలి యద్దంకి రాజధానిగా స్వరింత్రరెడ్డి రాజ్యమును సంస్థాపించెను. ఇదియే చరిత్రప్రసిద్ధమగు కొండవీటి సామ్రాజ్యముగా పెంపొందినది. ఈ రాజ్యస్థాపనలో నీ కురళభామణికి, కులగురువగు ఘోడెరాయంగంగయదేవుని తృప్తయ, తండ్రియగు ప్రోలారెడ్డి సంపాదించిన విశేషద్రవ్యము, సోదరుల, బంధువుల బాహుబలము సాధనములుగా సహకరించినవి.

వేమారెడ్డి పూర్వులది పంటరాష్ట్రము.⁴ ఈ వంశీయులు తొలుత తెలుగు చోడుల కొల్లులో సేనానులుగా నుండుచువచ్చిరి. క్రీ.శ. పదమూడవ శతాబ్ది ద్వితీయ పాదమున వీ రాత్మరాష్ట్రమునుండి తరలి, క్రిమముగా పర్భేమోత్రర దిశల వ్యాపించి కాకతీయుల కొలువున బ్రవేశించి, సేనాధిపత్యాద్యున్నత పదవులను సమర్థవంతముగ నిర్వహింప సాగిరి. పంటరాష్ట్రము నుండి యేతెంచిన వాగుటచే వీరు పంటవంశీయు లనబడిరి వీరి ప్రాచీన ప్రాభవ సూచకమైన 'దేనటి'యు దీనికి తోడ్పడి వీరి వంశము పంట దేనటి మహా న్వయముగా ప్రౌఢి గనినది. 'కోమటి' యనునది వీరి గృహనామము. వీరిది పెల్లచేరి గోత్రము.

పంట శాఖీయుల నోముల పంటయైన ప్రోలయ వేముడు (1324-1353) మొదటి నుండియు రణపండితుడుగనే గాక రాజనీతిజ్ఞుడుగను రాజకెక్కిను. అతడు చతుర్విధోపాయ

సంయుక్తవిగము. ఇందిలి పూర్వపదము 'రాట్' అను సంస్కృత శబ్దముతోడి సంనిహిత సంకీర్ణము కలది. ఈ 'రాట్టులు' లేక 'రట్టు' అనువారు రాష్ట్రమున వ్యావసాయక కులమును సేవించుటలో రాజు కు సహకరించు రాష్ట్రపుట్టె రాజకీయ ప్రాముఖ్యము వహించి ప్రత్యేక జన సంఘముగా మౌన్యకాలము నాటి గుర్తింప బడిరి. శాశవాహనుల కాలమునకు దిక్కును పీఠభూమి యిందిలి వివిధ ప్రాంతములలో విస్తరించిన ఈ రట్ట శాఖల వాఁలొని యొక తెగవారు రట్టలూర్ (రట్టలూర్) పురపరాధీశ్వరులైన 'రాష్ట్రకుటుంబు'గా రాజ్యమేలి, రట్టకుల భూషణులైరి. రట్టల ప్రధానవృత్తి సూచకమగు 'కుడియనే' (Cultivator) అను దేశ్యపదముయొక్క సూక్ష్మ రూపమగు 'కుడి' ఈ 'రట్ట' శబ్దమునకు చేరి 'రట్టకుడి' యైనది. ఇది కాల క్రమమున 'రట్టగుడి, రట్టగుట్టి, రాట్టగుడి, రాట్టోడి, రట్టోడి (రద్దోడి) రట్టడి, రద్డి, రెడ్డి'—అను వివిధరూపముల నొందినది. రేనాటి చోళుల, తూర్పుచాళుక్యుల కాలమునకే రాజ్యపాలనమున ముఖ్యాంశ పులుగ, రణములలో 'మార్బురుగు రట్ట గుళ్లు'గా మన్నన వడసిన ఈ రెడ్ల రెడ్డికము (రెడ్డికము) కాకతీయ యుగమున కడిమిగల నాయకత్వముగా మెలిసి, పదునాల్గవ శతాబ్ది ప్రథమ పాదమున పార్థివప్రాభవముతో కొండవీటి కోట కొత్తకములపై కోటికి పడగెత్తినది.

4. నేటి నెల్లూరు మండలమునందలి గూడూరు తాలూకాయు, తత్పరిచితప్రాంతములను ప్రాచీనకాలమున "పంటరాష్ట్రము"గా బరగుచుండినట్లు శాసనాధారమున నిరూపింప బడినది. Vide. History of The Reddi Kingdoms, P. 58.

ప్రజ్ఞాపంతుడు; షాద్గుణ్య ప్రయోగచతురుడు; గుణజ్యేష్ఠుడు. అన్నిటిని చూచి ఆర్కాధర్మోద్ధరణాఖితుడు. అందుకలముననే భారతవిద్యహరుషకభావారంభితుడు; విద్యదీప్తిద్రవ్యక సేవాపరుడు. కర్మాత్మలలో ఆగ్రణీయైన వేముడు దేవాలయముల 'దేవభోగము'లను, అర్చవిద్యాపాఠంగతులగు ఆధ్యాత్మిక విజ్ఞాన భిక్షుల ఆశీర్వాద హారముల నొసంగి, తురుష్కుల ముష్కృత్యములచే పంకిలములైన తెలుగు భాషులను హవిర్దూమ పరంపరచే పునీతము గావించి, 'వర్త ప్రతిష్ఠాగురు'డను ప్రఖ్యాతి నార్జించెను. శివగుణ సిద్ధుడైన యీ తేడు సింహాసన మధిష్ఠించిన కాలిది కాలమునకే శ్రీరైలాచోట గిరులకు సోపానముల నిర్మించి, పాతాళగంగకు మెట్లు కట్టించి, 'గురు జనులచే దేవాల సంఘాతుడుగా నన్నుతింపబడెను.

కాకతీయ చక్రవర్తుల పరిపాలనము నాచుక్కుముగా గైకొని రెడ్డియు 'ప్రవర్తకుడై' పెంపుగనిన ప్రోలయవేముని యాస్థానమున కొరాజిల్లిన వివక్షణలలో శేషము మహాదేవ పండితుడు ప్రథమ గణ్యుడు. ఈ విద్వత్కవి నాట్య శాస్త్ర వ్యాఖ్యాతయగు పల్లవోల్లయ సిద్ధాంతానుసారులగు శిష్య పంపరలోనివాడు; ఆ వ్యాఖ్యానమునకు చక్రవర్తి వివరణము వ్రాసిన మహామహోపాధ్యాయుడు; మఱియు లొల్లకుల ప్రవర్తకుడు. తొలుదొల్ల విద్యా నగర రాజాస్థాన కవిగా నుండిన యీ లొల్లమహాదేవార్యుడు అపరిమిత భాదాన పురురాము డయిన ప్రోలయవేముని యవదాత చరితముచే నాకర్షితుడై యుచుండి యదంత రాజ్య విద్యాకి కారియై వెలుగొందెను. ఇట్టి ఘనవిద్వాలయై లెందరో ఆ కాలమున దేవహిపాలుని యాస్థానమును వెదకికొని వచ్చుచుండిరి. దీనిని బట్టి, రెడ్డిరాజుల యాస్థానమున సన్మానము పడయుట సమున్నత గౌరవముగా ఆ నాటి సారస్వత లోకము రావించుచుండిన ఖ్యాహింప నగును. ఆచార్య ప్రమథరవి శ్రీగిరి, శంభుదాసు మొదలగు వారు వేరు కీలకుని కొలువున విలసిల్లిన సంస్కృతాంధ్రకవి కుముదబాంధవులు

ప్రోలయవేముడు మధ్యాంధ్రదేశక్షేమద కరవాలుడై, చతుర్శీతి దుష్ట నిర్మూలయై ఛార్మిరిమగు సామ్రాజ్యమును సుస్థిరము గావించుటయందు నిమగ్నుడై యుండినందున కడన లేచి యొనరింపకున్నను, ఆయనకుగల కవి పండితారణ క్రమగుణము వలనను, ప్రబంధ పరమేళుని పల్కులను బట్టియు, ఆ భూపతి గీర్వాణాంధ్ర కవిత్వానక్షత్ర శేఖరుడు, స్మృత గీత కళానల్లిలోపేతోత్సవుడునై యుండినట్లు నిష్ఠయింపగలము.

వల్లవాదిత్యుడు, బంధుసముద్రుడు, అరిరాయ బసవశంకరుడు, జగనొల్ల గిందెడు, ఏకరాయ స్థాపనాచార్యుడు, నప్తనంతాన ప్రతిష్ఠాపకుడు, అర్చిప్రతిర్ధి హేమాద్రిదావ నిరతుడు, అన్యయైకీపావనుడు, ఏకసింహాసనాలంకారుడు నయిన ప్రోలయవేమ మహిపతి ధర్మరక్షణ, వాఙ్మయభోషణ, ప్రజారంజనములయందు తనవంశీయులకే గాక తరువాతి రాజన్యైర్లలకు అమలినాదర్శమూర్తియై, అద్యుడై తనరారెను.

అనవోత సరపతి (1353-1364)

ప్రొలయవేముని యనంతర మతని చత్తపుత్రు లిర్వరిలో జ్యేష్ఠుడైన యనవోతరెడ్డి (1353-1364) రెడ్డిరాజ్య సింహాసిత నిధిష్ఠించెను. బాల్యమునుండియు నీరడు తండ్రికి సమరతంత్రమున, రాజ్యస్థాపనమున సహాయుడుగా నుండి పీఠాన్నవోతసృపతి యనెడు విఖ్యాతి నొందెను. ఇతడు, వేముని పాలనమున యువరాజుగా త్రిపురాంతక ప్రాంతమున కాదివత్సము వహించియుండి రాజ్యతంత్రమునందు మంచి యనుభవము గడించెను.

అనవోత భూపాలుడు రాజ్యమునకు వచ్చిన యనతి కాలముననే రాజధానిని స్థల దుగ్గపగు నద్దంకినుండి గిరిదుర్గముగు కొండవీడు (కుండిన పురము)నకు మార్చి, యా 'తైలపుండు'ను శత్రువులు మనస్సులో నైనను స్మరింపలేనంత పటిష్ఠముగా పునర్నిర్మించెను. ఈ కార్యమునను, మోటుపల్లి (ముకుళపురము) రేవున సాంయాత్రికులకు మహోదానముగా అభయ శాసనమును ప్రకటింపజేసి నౌకావాణిజ్యమును పెంపొందించుట యందును, శత్రువుల తాకిడికి తట్టుకొని నిలుచుట యందును, ప్రత్యర్థి ప్రతిపక్షదేశములను జయించుటలోను ఈ చున్నీడు కాకతి గణపతిదేవుని జ్ఞప్తి తెలియించును.

మహాకూరుడైన యనవోత సృపాలుడు రండివరెనే యవనావ హృతములగు నగ్రహారములను పునరుద్ధరించియు, వేదవేదాంగ పాఠంగతులగు విద్వాంసులకు నూతనముగ నగ్రహారములను ధారాదత్తము గావించియు పుమధార్మికుడుగా ప్రస్తుతించి బడియెను. 'దీప్తివవిజేత' యగు నీతడు తన పూర్వ దిగ్విజ్రయాశ్రయలో నొకపరి చక్షరామముననేగి భీమేశ్వర శ్రీమన్మహాదేవునకు పంచ ఘంటలను బహూకరించెను; బహుమనీ సేనల యలజదులకు గుఱియైన ధరణికోట యమరారామమును తన సేనానియగు మల్లి నాథవేమునచే పరిరక్షింపజేసి, యందలి యచరేశ్వర శ్రీ మన్మహాదేవుని పునఃప్రతిష్ఠితుని గావించెను. చరిత్రచతురాననులు వక్కాణించినటు లీ తేడు తన జనకునివలె పెక్కెండ్లు బ్రదికి యుండినయెడల రెడ్డిరాజ్యము ననే విధముల విస్తరింపజేసి కర్ణాటక సామ్రాజ్యమువలె నొక ఘన సామ్రాజ్యమును దక్షిణ హిందూ దేశమున స్థాపించియుండును.⁵

దృత బుధ పరిపాలుడు, ప్రత్యహము దానశీలుడు నైన యీ భూజాని యాస్థానము వేద విదులతో, వివిధ శాస్త్రవిహిత శ్రములైన విద్యవ్యరేణ్యులతో కిరవతంసులతో కళకళలాడుచుండినది. వారందరిలోను బాలనశక్తి యను మహావిద్వాంసుడు నాయకమణియై విద్యాధికారిగా విరాజిల్లుచుండెను. కొల్లూరగ్రహారమున వృత్తిని బడసిన కొలచలమ పెద్ద భట్టు, 'అన్నవోత భూజానికి సత్ప్రిబంధము లొసంగిన' వెన్నెలకంటి కవులు — ఆ నాటి యనేకులలో మనకు తెలియవచ్చు మణికొందరు మనీషినర్తములు.

విచక్షణుడు, వాఙ్మయపోషకసమజ్ఞావిలసితుడు నగు నీ భావమున పరిపాలనము ద్వారాశవత్సర మాత్రపరిమితమైనను, సయ్యది విక్రమమున, విధివమున, వికాసమున రెడ్డియుగమున కంతటికి ప్రాతినిధ్యము వహించ జాలియున్నది.

అనవేమ మహాపాలుడు (1364-1386)

అనపోతస్వపతి యనంతర మతని తనయుడైన కుమారగిరి బాలుడైనందున, సామ్రాజ్యశ్రేయోభిలాషులగు నమాత్యుల, యాత్మీయుల యభ్యున్నతమున నానిన రిమ్ముడనిచేముడు కొండవీటి సింహాసనము నారోహించెను. అంతకు పూర్వ మేలను అనయగ్రజునకు ప్రజా పాలనమును చేదోడువాదోడుగ మెలగి చెలగిసెవాడు. రాజ్యశ్రీ కమనీ స్వయంవరపతియైన యీ రాజేంద్రుడు సింహాసనము నధిరోహింపకమున్నే శత్రురాజుల నస్తాంగముల నాక్రమించిన శక్తిత్రయ సంపన్నుడుగా కవిశృంగపులచే కీర్తించబడినాడు.

ఆహవమున 'ననహాయ హుడు' 'కరవాల వైనతేయుడు'నని కొనియాడబడిన యనవేమ భూపాలుడు సింహాచలము వఱకు జైత్రయాత్ర యొనరించి, యా వింధ్యపాదమున కీర్తిస్తంభమును ప్రతిష్ఠింపజేసి, యచటి సింహాద్రినాథు ననేక దానముల నర్పితుని గావించెను. స్థల దుర్గ విదళన బలరాముడు, జల దుర్గ సాధన కఘరాముడు నైన యీ రెడ్డి సృపుడు కడిమిపెంపుని రాచకొండ రాజ్యమున నడుగిడి కణభేరి మొజయించుచు గార, తన యన్న చివరి కాలమున చేజారిపోయిన శ్రీశైల సీమను విజయనగరము వారినుండి పునరాక్రమించి మించెను. ఇట్టి 'కలియుగ వేతాళుడు' ప్రాకృత్తుని దిశలలో విజయ యాత్ర కొనసాగించి, రెడ్డి రాజ్యమును సింహపురి ప్రాంతమునుండి సింహశైల పర్యంతము, శ్రీశైలము నుండి సింధుపువఱకు విస్తరింపజేసి, విజయ సూచకముగా పంచారామములకు పంచమక్రితో నైదు గజఘంటలను బహూకరించెను.

మఱియు, నీతడు శ్రీశైల త్రిపురాంతక దక్షిణామ సింహాచలాద్యనేక పుణ్యక్షేత్రములలో నిర్మింపజేసిన మంటప గోపురాదిక నిర్మాణములు, మఱికొన్ని పునరుద్ధరణములు ఈ రాజన్యని సమభావనా సముల్లసిత పరమ మాహేశ్వరత్వమునకు ప్రత్యక్షసాక్ష్యములు. ప్రతి సోమవార మితడు కొండవీటినుండి యంచె గుఱ్ఱములపై కృష్ణాసాగర సంగమ సలమున కరిగి యచటి ముక్తిశ్వరుని ముదమార నేవించి వచ్చెడివాడట : ఇది యీ పార్తివేంద్రుని పంచ శిష్యానా పర్యుత్సకతకు ప్రత్యేక నిదర్శనము.

ఈ భూజాని, మేచ్చావహృతములగు ప్రాచీన శిష్టాగ్రహారములను పునరుద్ధరించుట తోపాటు, శ్రౌతస్మార్తాది సంస్కృత విద్యల నమది కాభ్యుదయము నిమిత్తము సార తరములైన తీరభూములను, తృణకాష్ఠజల సమృద్ధిగల గ్రామములను విద్యుత్కుటుంబములకు విరివిగా

వితరణము గావించి విద్యజ్ఞనజీవముడుగా వెలుగొందెను. 'బహుశహస్ర సువర్ణదాన సంతోషిత మహాకవీశ్వరుడు'గా నెగడిన యీ నెఱదాతయొక్క ఈ యుత్తమ దాన వ్యసనమే యీతనిని 'ధర్మాన్న మేజన'గా దసరజేసినది.

కవుల పాలిటి కల్పతరువైన యనవేముని యాస్థానిలో పొలుపొందిన పీఠులగిలిన విద్యత్కవులలో బాలనరస్వతి (విద్యాధికారి), శారదావల్లభుడైన త్రిలోచనచార్యుడు (విద్యాధికారి), ప్రకాశభారతీయోగి చరిత్రకందినవారు.

కళాపోషకుడగు నీ తేని ఘనకార్యములలో వసంతోత్సవ పునరుద్ధరణము ముఖ్యముగా నెన్నదగి యున్నది. ఈ 'వసంతరాయడు' నిర్వహించుచుండిన వసంతోత్సవములలో వివిధ దిశల వెంజిల్ల బడిన కర్పూరఖండముల మూలమున పరిమేశ్వరుడు సైతము పరిమళ భరిత వస్త్రధారణానుభవవైభవమును వడసి యానందించెనట : ధర్మాత్ములలో నగ్రజీయైన యీ చూమీకుని పాలనములో ప్రజలు మృద్వన్నమును, మృదులాంబరమును, మృగమదమును, చామీకరాంబర చామరాదులను బడసి విలసిల్లుచుండి రన నిక విద్యత్తల్లజుల, కవివృషభుల కిమనీయ విభవమును గూర్చి పేర్కొన నేల ?

రాజ్యశ్రీరమణీస్వయంవరపతి, ఊరికానహాయుడు, చతుర్విధోపాయుడు, మహానీ యాంధ్ర పట్టాభిషేక సంవృత మహాభాగ్యుడు, షట్కాల శివపూజాధురంధరుడు, దారిద్ర్య విద్రావణుడు, ప్రజాపరితోషకారి, వేలకొలది కవులకు పేనవే లొసంగిన వదాన్య శేఖరుడు నైన యనవేముడు, కొండపీటి పాలకు లందరలో నగ్రేసరుడు; అదిరాజనిభుడగు నాచర్య ప్రభవరేణ్యుడు.

కర్పూర వసంతరాయలు (1386-1402)

అనవేమ మహీపాలాని యసంతర మనవోతనరేంద్రుని కుమారుడు కుమారగిరి తన యనుగు బావయైన కాటయవేముని సాహాయ్యమున, జ్ఞాతిజనకల్పితావరోధముల నధిగమించి కుండిన నగర సింహాసనాధ్యానియై కొమరారెను. అనవోతారెడ్డి త్రిపురాంతక ప్రాంతమునకు యువరాజుగా నాధిపత్యము వహించియుండిన కాలమున నీతడు జనియించుటచే, వరమ శివ నిలయముగా బెంపుగనిన యచటి కుమారాచలము పే రీతని కభిధానముగా నమరినది.

ఈ యుగమునందలి ప్రప్రథమ రాజకవివర్యుడైన యీ కొమరగిరి రాజేంద్రుడు, ప్రజాశాలియగు వండితుడు కార్యఖడ్గ సముదీర్ఘుడు సర్వసమర్థుడు నగు కాటయవేము నమాత్యునిగా నొనర్చుకొని, రాజ్య భారము నాతని భుజస్కంధములపై నిడి, వసంతోత్సవ ములచే, వసంతరాజీయ రచనచే, బుధ విబుధ ప్రతిష్ఠాది సమస్త సత్కార్య నిర్వహణముల చేతను విశ్చింతగా, నిర్మలధర్మ పురస్కరముగా జీవితమును గడపెను.

అనివేము చారంబించిన వసంతోత్సవముల నీత డవచి తిప్పియశ్రేష్ఠి సహకారమున వేవిధముల విస్తరింపజేసి 'కర్పూరవసంతరాయడై' కీర్తి గనెను. ఈ సమయమున కొలువున లక్ష్మీనద్యశయ, నితినికి 'ప్రియానవృక్షప్రియ'యు నైన 'లక్ష్మీ' యను నాస్థాన లాసి యుండెడిది. ఆ రాజనర్తకి యాతని వసంతరాజీయ నాట్యకావ్యలక్షణములను పలు తెలుగుల నూత్నాభినయముల మూలమున ప్రపంచీకరించి ప్రదర్శించుచు పరితోషకారిణి యగుచుండెడిదట :

ఈ నృపోత్తముడు సింహాననము నభిష్ఠించిన యనతికాలముననే రాజరాజమున కరిగి, సుత సహితముగ తులయాగి, తులాపురుషవాన మొనర్చి, కౌమాద్రవాన చింతా ముణులగు తన పూర్వులను మించిన దాన పీఠుడుగా ప్రస్తుతి గనెను. కిశోరేంద్రయగు సత్యద్రుక్రీడానరొపరిములతో గూడిన యనేక లీలాగృహములను, అందును పుష్పక ప్రాసాద జాతికి చెందిన సమున్నత 'గృహరాజ' సౌధమును నిర్మింపజేసి 'రాజశిల్పి'గా ప్రఖ్యాతి గాంచెను

కొండవీటి పరాక్రమప్రభ కటకమువరకు ప్రసరించి, శ్రీకైల సింహాచలములు సామ్రాజ్య జయస్తంభములుగా శోభిల్లుచున్న యాకాలమున క్రీ.శ. 1395 ప్రాంతమున నీ ప్రభుని యేకైక పుత్రుడు, రాజమహేంద్రవర ప్రాంతపు యువరాజు నైన రెండవ యనవోత నృపతి యరాలమృతి నొందెను. ఈ విషాద సంఘటనమునుండి యిండుకి కోజుకొనిని పిదిప, కుమారగిరి యా రాజమహేంద్రవర రాజ్యమును, 25 యడ్డుదలమునకు మూల రాజుడై, తన సుబ్బస్వమై తనరిని కాటయవేమునకు వీరిజీవరిము (Jagir) గా మిగుల ఉత్తములతో నొసంగెను.⁶ ఈ కృత్యము కొండవీటి చరిత్రమునందు క్రొత్త మలుపునకు రారాణుడయ్యెను. ఆ సమయమున దుర్గాదేవికడ వనెడి వీరకైకము దేశమున విలయ స్మృత్యము సేయచుండెను. అందులకుదోడు బహ్మనీలమిటి దాహ్య శత్రువుల తిక్కు ప్రారంభమయ్యెను. అట్టి ప్రతీపపరిస్థితులలో సంకళిత్రువుల సజ్జచేయుటయం దొకింత కఠికుదనము వహించిన కుమారగిరి యెడ ససంతుష్టతైన రాజోద్యోగుల యండ చండలతో, జ్ఞాతియగు పెదకోమటి వేము చాతనిపై తీవ్రముగ నొత్తిడి తెచ్చి కొండవీటి సింహాసీనిని కైవసమొనర్చుకొని తన చీరకాలాశయమును ఫలింపజేసికొనెను.

సవనీత సదృశమృదుమధురస్వధాపుడు, నాట్యదేవపారంగతుడగు నుత్తమవిద్వాంసుడు, రిశావంతుడు, రశాప్రోషకుడు, ధీరలలితుడు, లోకాశీతమహిముడు నైన కుమారగిరి ప్రభుని పాలనము ఈ యుగమున వర్ధిల్లిన సంస్కృత వాఙ్మయమునకు నిక్కముగా వసంతోదయము.

6. ఈ రాజమహేంద్రవర రాజ్యప్రధానమునాట కుమారగిరికుమారుడైన రెండవ యనవోతరెడ్డి జీవించియుండునని కొండవీటి తలంపు. vide. రెడ్డి రాజులు. PP.81-82.

తిమ రాజ్యము కుమారాచలేశ్వరసి ప్రసాదముగా భావించిన ప్రోలయవేమూడి రాజన్యుల కిమనీయ భక్తిభావనయే ఈ యూరవనంతరాయలుగా ప్రభవించి, పంట పంశకీర్తి ప్రభులను కర్పూర సౌంధ్యముతోపాటుగా కుబంతముల విరజిమ్మెనని పక్కాణింపబడును

సర్వజ్ఞ చక్రవర్తి (1402 - 1420)

ప్రోలయవేముని యన్నయ, చంపవోలు (ధనదపురము) పాలకుడు సగు మాచా రెడ్డికి మనుమడు, పెదకోమటిండ్రునిపుత్రుడు నైన కోమటివేముడు కొండవీటి మండలేశ్వరులందే గాక, కాకతీయానంతరయుగ శ్మేషతులలోనెల్ల కనీష్ఠికాధిష్ఠితు డగు కోవిదవరేణ్యుడు. “వాణీనఖముఖముఖరిత పీఠా మాధుస్యధుర్య వాగ్మయిత్తి” యైన యీ యవసీకుని పరిపాలనాకాలము సంస్కృతవాఙ్మయమనోజ్ఞచరిత్రమునందలి సురుచిర సువర్ణపత్రము.

రాజ్యముతో పాటు సారస్వత సామ్రాజ్యము నేలిన రాజకవి పుంగవులలో ఈ పేమ భూపాలునకు శ్రీహర్షునితో చక్కని సాహిత్యము సరిపడి యుండుట విచిత్రమగు విషయము. హర్షవర్ణముడు ఉత్తర హిందూస్థానమును పాలించిన చివరి హైందవచక్రవర్తి యైనట్లే కోమటి వేముడు కొండవీటి సామ్రాజ్యము నేలిన చివరి రెడ్డిరాజు⁷. కన్యాకుబ్జమందలి యీ రాజాధిరాజు నాస్థానమున భట్టబాణ, మయూరు లనెడి ప్రఖ్యాత కవీభవులు భాసించినటులే కుండినపురమందలి యీ మహామండలేశ్వరుని కొల్లుకూటమున వామనబాణ, శ్రీనాథు లనెడు నుద్దండక వివృషభు లుల్లసిల్లిరి. హర్షుని చరితము నాఖ్యాయికా రూపమున భట్టబాణుడు ప్రణయించిన తీరుననే వేమభూపతి చరిత్రమును వామనుడు వీరనారాయణ చరిత్రముగా వెలయించినాడు. పాండిత్యమున, కవితా రచనమున, కళాపోషణమున, పదాన్యగుణ వర్ధితనిస్తుల యశమున నీయిర్వరు రాజన్యులును చరిత్రకెక్కిన చరితార్థులే! భౌతికము లగు రాజ్య విస్తీర్ణ, పాలనాకాల పరిమితులం దానితో నితనికి పోలిక పొసగకున్నను సారస్వతికమగు శౌర్యసంపదయందీత డతని కేమాత్రము తీసిపోవడని ఘంటాఘోషముగ నుడువవచ్చును.

గీర్వాణ భారతీ కల్యాణవేది కలంకారములు కైసేసిన యీ వాఙ్మయశిల్పివరేణ్యుని యాస్థాన కవివతంసుడగు వామనభట్టు అనేకరసవత్కావ్య రచనాధురీణుడు. ఈ విద్వత్ప్రభుని విద్యాధికారియైన శ్రీనాథుడు బ్రాహ్మదత్తవరప్రసాదు డగు కవిసార్వభౌముడు. ఈ మహిళాని మంత్రిమణి మామిడి సింగన యనల్పధిషణాసమేతుడు; పంచాంగ

7. ఓఘువాళమందలి యన్నవర్ణుని క్షుప్తికెలయుచు నీతని కుమారుని (రాచవేముడు : 1420 - 1424) నాలుగేండ్ల నామమాత్రపు పాలన మిందు పరిగణింపబడలేదు.

స్థిమంత్రరక్షణ కి శాస్త్రపదీలుడు సగు అమాత్యమాదామణి. ఇట్టి విశిష్టమహాపురుష చతుష్టయము సన్నిహితులగు సమకాలికు లయి, సామ్రాజ్య విజయములను పొందిన సాహితీ సామ్రాజ్య విజయములను సమన్వయపూర్వకముగ సాధించియుండు అచ్చెరువు గొల్పు విషయము.

ఈ నల్వరు విద్యనృణుల ప్రాపున నీ యుగమున “సంస్కృత సారస్వత మండపము” గృహరాజ సౌధమువోలె గగనచుందిగ దెంపొంది దిగ్విదిక్కుల వాఙ్మయ దీప్తిని విజిల్చునది. వీరిలో నొకడైన శ్రీనాథభట్టసుకవిచే నసంతర కాలమున నీ మండపముపై సమున్నత విజయవరాళ “దివిజకవివరు గుండియల్ దిగు” రనునటు లావిష్కరింపబడినది. అపూర్వవరసుగు ఈ సారస్వతవిజయభృజుడే, ఆ నాటి వాఙ్మయాభ్యుదయమున కాదికారణులయిన యా రెడ్డిరాజుల యుదారచరిత్రమునకు శాశ్వత చిహ్నమై నతతము వెలుగొందుచున్నది.

రాజ్యనిర్వహణమున పెదకోమటి చేముడు అనుచేను భూపుని పరిపాలనా విధానములను పూనికతో నివలంబించి యాచరించెను. విద్యాధికారి పదవీ పునరుద్ధరణము, కులదైవత మగు మూలాంకురేశ్వరికి (ముల్లగూరమ్మ) మందిర ప్రాకారాదుల నిర్మాణము, అనవేము తొసంగియుండిన గ్రామ దానములను పునరుద్ధరించుట, పెక్కు పుణ్యక్షేత్రములు దర్శించి, ఆ యా తావుల సనేకధర్మశాసనములు వెలయించుట, కవిపండితుల కటుతముగా వివిధాగ్రహారాధిక వితరణము, తటాక నిర్మాణము — మున్నగు కార్యము లిందులకు ముఖ్య నిదర్శనములు.

కళింగ గజపతులు, కృష్ణ కవితలి వెలమ ప్రభువులు, బహ్మనీ సుల్తానులు, పల్నామ దక్షిణ దిశలయందలి విజయనగరరాయర్లు — అను నిందరికి సంగర సంగములందు సమాధానము తొసంగి సంబాళించుకొనుచునే, ఈ యుగమునకు మకుటాయమానమైన వాఙ్మయాభ్యున్నతిని సముపార్జించినటువంటి ఈతని యనుభావవిశేషము నిరుపమానము. తన సోదరుడగు మాచా రెడ్డికి కొండపల్లిప్రాంతము నొసంగుట, స్వజనులగు కాటయవే, మాల్లాడరెడ్ల యెడ ప్రబలవైరము వహించుట — అను నీతని విధానములు కొండవీటి సామ్రాజ్యము బలహీన మగుటకు ఎగుల తోడ్పడినవని చారిత్రకుల నిశ్చయము.

వివిధ విద్యా ప్రాగల్భ్యముచే విద్యనృణిఘోషానికపుడై వెలసిన యీ తేడు సంగీత, సాహిత్య చింతామణులనెడు నుత్తమ శాస్త్ర గ్రంథములను, అమరుకళతక, గాథాసప్తశతీ సారములకు ప్రామాణికములగు వ్యాఖ్యలను, “వీరనారాయణచరిత” కావ్యకదంబమును రచించి, సాక్షాత్సంస్వతీ స్వరూపులగు కవిసాహిత్యభాములచే “సప్తజ్జ చక్రవర్తి”గా సంబోధితుడై సముచితరీతిని సంభావింపబడియెను.

పై న పేర్కొనబడిన పండిత రవి ప్రకాండలతోపాటి విద్యావసీకుని కొలువున భూలోకధన్వంతరి యను ప్రసిద్ధిచొందిన బాస్కరార్యుడు, అతని పాత్రుడు, ఘన వైద్యుడు, పండితోత్తముడు నగు సింగరార్యుడు, చైవజ్ఞశేఖరుడు, విద్యత్కుటుంబియు నైన పెద్దయజ్ఞు, అతని సుతుడు రామచంద్ర జ్యోతిషికుడు, విద్యావినయాన్వితుడగు విశ్వేశ్వరుడు మున్నగు విద్వాంసులనేకులు విరాజిల్లుచుండిరి. వీరు గాక పలు విద్యల నేర్చిన ప్రౌఢులు మఠేంద్రలో చేముని యాస్థానిని దర్శించి, విద్యత్పరీక్షల నంది యగ్రహార దానాది ఘన సన్మానముల వడసి యా ధర్మశిష్యాలుని యావిని వేనోళ్ళ కీర్తించుచు వెడలుచుండిరి. ఇట్లేతని కాలమున కొండవీటి కొల్వకూట చుదియొక సకల విద్యావిహారభూమిగా సన్నుతి గన్నది :

శ్రీతపోషణుడు, బుధతోషణుడు, సత్యభాషణుడు, జ్ఞాతయగు దాత, అర్పణని చింతామణి, అయుతాన్నదాన నిరతుడు, అతుల బలదాముడు, ధుమ్మిద పరిపంథి శిఖరి చంఢోశి, విద్యదగ్రణి, వీరనారాయణుడు, పరమమాహేశ్వరుడు నగు పెదకోమటన్న చేము డఖిలావనీశ చూడామణి యగు అన్ననాయకమణి :

కాటయవేముశాసనం (1394 - 1412)

ప్రౌఢయచేముని చొహిత్రుడు, కాటయరెడ్డి కుమారుడు, అనవోతస్సృపతి కిల్లుడు నైన కాటయవేముడు కొండవీటి రాజబంధువులలో నెల్ల కడుంగడు ప్రసిద్ధుడు. అఖండ పాండిత్యము, అసమాన రాజసీతి చాతుర్యము, అవక్రపరాక్రమము గల యీ వీరవిద్వాంసుడు తన బావమరది యగు కుమారగిరిని స్వకీయ ప్రజ్ఞా ప్రాభవములచే కొండవీటి సింహాసీత నధిస్థింపజేసి, తా నతనికి ప్రధానియు, సేనానియునై, ధర్మరాజునకు శ్రీకృష్ణునివలె తోడునీడగ తనరారెను.

ఇమ్మడి హరిహరరాయల యాత్మజును పరిణయ మాడుట ద్వారా రెడ్డిరాజ్యమునకు విజయనగరపు ప్రాపును చేకూర్చుట, రేచెల్ల వెలమ నృపులతోడి విరోధమును పెంచ కుండుట, రాజమహేంద్రవర ప్రాంతమున ప్రబలురైయున్న దువ్వూరి కుటుంబమందలి యల్లాడరెడ్డితో వియ్యమందిరి బాంధవ్యమును సన్నిహిత పఱచుటద్వారా వారి యండ చండలతో ఆ ప్రాంతమున కొమంగిరి పరిపాలనమును నిరుపద్రవము గావించుట - మున్నగు కార్యము లీ నయప్రపీణుని “అతి సురుగురు భార్యవమతి”కి తార్కాణములు.

5. హరిహర రాయల పుత్రుని యందు కాటయవేమునకు జనించిన వేమాంబను అల్లాడ రెడ్డి శ్రేష్ఠ పుత్రుడగు అల్లియ వేముడు పంజాయమాడెను. అట్లే అనవోతస్సృపతి దుహిత యగు చొడ్డాంబికయును కాటయవేమునకు జనించిన అనితల్లిని అల్లాడ రెడ్డి రెండవ కుమారుడు వీరభద్రారెడ్డి వివాహమయ్యెను.

సంగ్రామ ధనంజయుడగు నీతడు, కొమరగిరి కోరిక మేరకు ప్రాగుత్తల విశలలో జైత్రయాత్ర సాగించి, సింహాచలాది వింధ్యపాదములయందు, కీరసంస్తీరమున విజయ ధ్వజములను ప్రతిష్ఠించి, కొండవీటి ఛాటిని గజపతికి చవి చూపించి కిటకచూడ కారుడై కడిమి మెఱసెను; ఈ విజయలక్ష్మీవరణానంతరము కుమరగిరి నియోగమున కాళిదాస రూపక త్రయమునకు పడు ప్రామాణికములగు “కుమరగిరి రాజీయ” వ్యాఖ్యలను విచ్చించెను. ఈ విద్వత్తల్లజుని బహముఖ వైదుష్యము నుద్ఘాటించుచున్న యీ యుత్తమ వ్యాఖ్యలు పునర్ముద్రణ భాగ్యము నొందింపదగియున్నవి.

మహా విద్వాంసుడగు నీత డనంభ్యాక రచీకృతుల కాశ్రయమై కీర్తిగాంచెను. మనుతుల్యుడగు నీ మంత్రిమణియొద్దనే “కలియుగదాత” గా ప్రస్తుతుడైన రాయని భాస్కరుడు రాయసముగను, మంత్రిశక్తిమహిముడగు జితసము పెద్దిరాజు మంత్రిగను రాజిల్లిరి. ఆర్యధర్మ పక్షజైక దీక్షితుడగు ఈ సృపవతంసుడు వివిధ విద్యావేత్తలగు విబుధులకు అగ్రహారాదిక మును, దేవాలయములకు దేవభోగములను అనంభ్యాకముగా నొసంగి యార్చనసంస్కృతీ వికాసమున కద్వితీయ ప్రోత్సాహము నందించెను. తాను, తన కుటుంబమువారు నొసంగిన యా భూదానములు తరతరము నిరంతరాయముగ కొనసాగుటకై యీత డహోబల ప్రాంతమునుండి తన కాపులగు ననేక భూమంజిరెడ్ల కుటుంబములను దెచ్చి భీమమండలమున నెలకొల్పియున్నాడు. ఈతని ధర్మాభిరతి యంతటి దూరదృష్టి కలది :

కొండవీటి సామ్రాజ్య నౌకకు కర్ణధారియై యప్రతీపప్రతాపమున వరలుచుండినతాను తలంచినమాత్రమున నవలీలగా నేకచ్ఛత్రాధిపతి కాగల్గియుండియు, అట్టి విపరీతపు టాలోచన కణుమాత్రమైన నవకాళమీయని నిర్మలాంతఃకరణముతో కొమరగిరినే తన “కులస్వామి” గా కొలుచుచు, ఆ రాజు నాజ్ఞ నమ్మనముమాలికనువోలె బెదలను దాల్చి, యాచరించినట్టి యీ శూరశిఖామణి యెక్క సౌశీల్యము సర్వజన శ్లాఘనీయము

“అతి భారవ విజయ విఖ్యాతి” గల యీ వీరవరేణ్యుడు స్వబాహుబలసంపాదిత మైన రాజ మహేంద్రవర రాజ్యమును, కుమరగిరి విక్రమతోషితుడై యిచ్చిన పిదపనే — అదియు ఆ రాజు నెడ ద్విగుణీకృతమగు నాదర భావముతోడనే — స్వీకరించెను. కర్నూర వసంతరాయలు కావించిన సమస్త ధర్మకార్యములయందు, సర్వకళాపరిపోషణమునందును కాటయవేముడు చేదోడు వాడోడై చెలగి మెలంగెను. వేయేలా ఈతడు తలచిన తలపులలో, వ్రాసిన వ్రాతలలో, చేసిన చేతలలో నన్నింట కుమరగిరి యెడల నీతనికిగల కృతజ్ఞతాభావము, కుమరగిరిని గూర్చిన శ్రేయోభిలాష ప్రతిబింబించుచున్నవి. ‘కుమరగిరి రాజీయ’ వ్యాఖ్యలు, ‘కొమరగిరిపుర’ దానములు ఇత్యాదులన్నింటితోపాటు, ఈతని యాత్మజుని యభిధానము కూడ కుమరగిరియే :

రెడ్డిరాజ్యములు రెండింటికీ సంబంధపేతువై (Political Link) వెలసిన యీ కాటమరెడ్డి వేమారెడ్డి, కొండవీటి రాజగురువులు. త్రిపురాంతక వాస్తవ్యులు నగు మోడె

రాయవంశీయులను పట్టినకేంద్రమందు నెలకొల్పుట. కులదేవతయగు ముల్లగూరిశక్తిని రాజహేంద్రవరమున ప్రతిష్ఠింపట. గోపీనాథదేవ విశేషార్చనము, వసంతోత్సవి నిర్విహణము, పరాశరకైలము (కోరుకొండ)ను వేదాద్రి వైభవముతో విలసిల్ల జేయుట — మొదలగు కార్యములచే కొండపీటి ప్రాభవమును రాజమహేంద్రవరమున సాదుకొల్పెను. ఆ కాలమున నితని కన్నీ విధముల సమానుడైయుండిన కోమటి పేమునితో, పరిస్థితుల ప్రాబల్యమువలన నీతని కేంద్రీయింపిన ప్రబల శత్రుత్వమే కొండపీటి సామ్రాజ్యము దుర్బల మగుటకు దోహదమొనర్పినది పండితాఖండలలైన యీ యిరువురు పేమన్యువులును ఏకాభిప్రాయులై మెలగియుండిన ఈ యుగ చరిత్ర మంకొక సరిణిని సాగియుండెడిది !

చతుర్విధోపాయ నిపుణుడగు సుమార్క సత్తముడు, సమర్థుడైన సేనాధిపతి, అపజయ మెఱుగని యనహాయ కూరుడు, పరిపాలనాచక్షుడగు పండితాగ్రణి, ఎరుమివ ద్వేషములేని యుత్తమ విష్ణు భక్తుడు, చిత్తి గంటముల రెంటు చడిమిపోడిచి కనిబట్టిన కవ్వడి యయిన కాటయవేముకొరి ఈ యుగ హైందవ ధర్మ పీఠులలో అద్వితీయుడు !

అల్లయవేము పీఠభద్ర వసుధేశులు (1423 - 1448)

కర్నూటవసంతరాయల కాలమునుండియు కాటయవేమునకు రాజమహేంద్రవర ప్రాంతమున పాలనా ప్రతినిధియై, కుడిభుజమై, కూర్చు వియ్యంకుడై ప్రవర్తిల్లిన బల్లిదుడు, దురిత రహిత చిత్తుడు, దువ్వూరి యల్లాడ రెడ్డి ఇతడు పోర్చుగీస్ గోత్రమునకు జెందిన పంటాస్వయ ప్రముఖుడగు పెరుమాండి రెడ్డికి పోత్రుడు; దొడ్డా రెడ్డికి తనయుడు కాటయ వేముని యనంతల మసతి కాలమునకే యతని కుమారుడు రెండవకుమారగిరి దివంగతుడై నపుడు స్వామిద్రోహులవలన రాజ్యము శత్రు హస్తగతము కాగా, ఈ యల్లాడ భూపతి యాద్రోహికులము నంతటని నిర్మూలించి యీ రాజ్యమున కేతైక వాసురాలును, తన రెండవ కోడలు నగు ననితల్లి⁹ కర్పించెను. ఈ శత్రునిర్మూలనావసరమున నీతనికి సేనానియగు నరహరినేడు, మంత్రియగు నరియేటిలింగనయు, తన సుతులు నల్వరును

జానటయై యుండిరి. చతుర్విధోపాయ చతురుడైన యీ యల్లాడ భూపతి యనితల్లి పక్షమున రాజమహేంద్రవర రాజ్యమును పెదకోమటి వేమాది ప్రతిపక్షల కజేయముగ క్రీ.శ. 1420 వరకు పరిపాలించెను అల్లాడ భూపతి యనంతర మతని యన్నకుమారు లిర్వురు “లాంగూర గజపతి” సాయమున నీ రాజ్యమును వశపఱచుకొని నాల్గు వత్సరములు (1420-23) మాత్రము పాలింపగల్గిరి. అల్లాడ రెడ్డి యగ్రసుతుడగు వేముడు దానోపాయమున గజపతితో

9. కర్నూట వసంతరాయల మేకోడలగుట నీమె రాజమహేంద్రవర రాజ్యమున కేతైక వాసురాలైనది. “విమలగుణాయత, అననిసురసుధ, పవిత్రచారిత్రవధూమతిల్లి” యయిన యీ అన్నవల్లంకికను విసాక్షణభౌముడు కాశీఖండము “సాక్షాదిదిరా దేవత” యని స్వభావోక్తియుతిముగ కొనియాడియున్నాడు.

మైత్రినెలవి, తన జ్ఞాతులను త్రోసిరాజని యనతి కాలముననే రాజమహేంద్రవర సింహాసనమును పునరాక్రమింపగలిగెను.

పటాన్యయ గ్రామణులగు నీ హాపాలాగ్రణులు తొలుత నుండియు తమ రాజ్యము మూర్ఛింపబడియున్నపుని మహాప్రసాదముగా భావించి, యా కులదైవము షేర, త్రిలింగ హిమండలాఖండలులై ప్రాచీనవిక్రమ స్ఫురణతో రాజ్యమును పరిపాలించిరి. కులగురువు ఘోషియరాయభీమేశ్వరుని యమోఘశీర్షచనములును, బెండపూడి (అరియేటి) యన్నామాత్యుని బుద్ధి బలమును, ఉన్నతి వైభవాధ్యులు, కవి ద్విజ బుధబంధు ప్రజాదీక్షదక్షులు ఉత్తమశ్లోకులు నైన ఈ యన్నదమ్ములకు అంగరక్షగా అలరినవి.

వీరి పాలనారంభకాలమునకు కొండవీటిరాజ్యము చాలభాగము విజయనగర సామ్రాజ్యమున విలీనమైపోయెను. ఈయిరువురలో నొకడగు నల్లయవేముని యర్ధాంగి యిమ్మడి హరిహర రాయల దౌహిత్రీ యగుటచే ఆ విద్యానగర పాలకులతో వీరికి మైత్రీ కుదిరి యుంచినది. కళింగ గణపతి యంతకు మున్నే నెయ్యిదై యుండెను. తక్కిన బహుశా సుల్తానులతోను వీరు చెలిమి నే నెఱపుచుండిరి. ఇట్లు కిర్కాట్కొక పారశీక నృపసఖ్యము వలన నెట్టి యలజడులు లేక వీరు ప్రశాంతతతో ప్రజారంజకముగ పాలనము సేయు చుండిరి. ఇంతలో క్రీ.శ. 1430 ప్రాంతమున కళింగమున సంభవించిన గాంగ, కపిలేశ్వర చలక కలహముల యడనున నీ సోదరులు, మున్ను తాము దానోపాయము కారణముగా క్రోల్పోయిన దక్షిణకళింగమును పునరాక్రమించి ధర్మోత్తరముగా, సుభిక్షముగా పరిపాలింప దొడగిరి. ఈ రాజు లలాగులు గీర్వాణవాఙ్మయాభివృద్ధికి, తద్వారా ఆర్థ సమస్కృతీ వికాసమునకు మిగుల తోడ్పడిరి.

వీరిచే గౌతమీ తటములయం దగ్రహారములను, పృథ్వీలను బడసినవారెల్లరును చేరి, శాస్త్ర, పురాణ, కావ్య, నాటకాలంకార సాహిత్య పారావార పారంగతులే ; వివిధాగ్రహారములయందలి యా ధరణీబృందారక బృందములు చతుర్వేదములను, షడ్సాస్త్రములను చుదురు కంఠములతో పఠించుచుండగా అంబుధిధాన్యము వినవచ్చు చుండెడిదట ; ఆ నల్లిండ్లయందలి వేదమూర్తుల యిండ్లలో వెండియు, పైడియు పడబడుచుండినవట !

అపద్ధావల్లభారాదకులగు నీ భూవల్లభులు అగ్రహారములనేగాక, సింహాచలము, శ్రీగిరి, కాంచి, కాశీ, పంచరామములు మున్నగు క్షేత్రములందు వెలసియున్న దేవతా మూర్తులకు ఆపరిమిత భూదానములను, దేవభోగములను సభక్తకముగ సమర్పించి ఆ య స్థలములందు శాసనములు వ్రాయించిరి.

వీరి కాలమున విలసిల్లిన పండితకవిశేఖరులలో సంగీతరత్నాకరమునకు వ్యాఖ్య వ్రాసిన సింగనభట్టు, శాసనకవులగు శ్రీవల్లభుడు, సరస్వతీభట్టు, వైద్యవిద్యా విశారదుడగు

కాళనాథ భిషగ్వరుడు, విద్వాంసులగు ఆతని కుమారులు-మున్నగు వారెందరో శాసనాధ్యాపాముల వలన తెలియపచ్చుచున్నారు. పీఠందరిలోను “కర్ణాట క్షితిపాల మోక్షిక సభా గారాంతరా తిత్పిత స్వస్థి స్థాన జగత్ప్రసిద్ధ కవి రాజు,” “పీఠభద్రాచెడ్డివిద్వాంసుడు” నైన శ్రీనాథుడు విశిష్టతముడు. ఈ సకల విద్వాంసనాథుడు కొండవీటికి, రాజమహేంద్రవరము నకు సంస్కృతి సేతువు (Cultural Link)గా వర్ధిల్లిన మహాకవి. ఈ భూవతుల కాలమున రాజధానియగు రాజమహేంద్రవరముట్లు వివిధవిద్యత్ప్రవిబృందమందిరమై, సకల శా కేంద్రమై సాంద్ర విభవముతో నొప్పారుచుండినది.

ఈ రాజసౌందర్య ప్రవిమల శివభక్తి, పరమేశ్వరసంపూజనము - చెడ్డి మన్నీ ందరలో పీఠికా భవ్యమైన స్థానమును పరికల్పించినది. ఈ మహా ప్రమథులు త్ర్యంబ కాదల తిన్యకాంబుపూరంబున అఘమర్షణ స్నాన మాచరించి, నిద్రమైన మడుంగు నీర్కావి దోవతులు ధరించి, విభూతి పుద్రాక్షమాలాలంకృతులై, పుండరీకాజినముల గూర్చుండి, షోడశోపచార పూర్వకముగ శంకరు నర్పించు వేళల ద్వితీయశంభులవలె చాల నొప్పారు చుండిరని కవిసార్వభౌముడు కనులకు గట్టినట్లులు వర్ణించియున్నాడు.¹⁰

ఈ సహోదరద్వయము, తమరాజ్యము యవన కర్ణాట కటకసామ్రాజ్యముల నడుమ నున్నను, అది ఆయా ప్రత్యర్థుల కందని సూనిఫలమగునట్లు అవక్రిపరాక్రమముతో, రాజనీతి చాతురీ మహిళమగు ఐకమత్యముతోడను పరిపాలించిన విషయము అంద్రదేశ చరిత్రములో అపురూపమైన అధ్యాయము.

అపూర్వ సహోదరులు, అభినవభోజులు, అశ్రాంత విశ్రాణన క్రీడా పరాయణులు, ఉత్తమశ్లోకులు, సాహిత్యకాసంగీతలక్ష్మలక్షణభంగీనర్వజులు, విజయ రఘురాములు, పల్లవరాయ స్థాపనాచార్యులు, విక్రమోన్నిద్రులు, సర్వగుణైకభద్రులు, షట్కాలసంపూజిత

10. i) “త్ర్యంబకాచల కన్యకాంబుపూరంబున, అఘమర్షణ స్నానమాచరించి

.....

.....
చాల నొప్పారు చెడ్డవ నొకుట్లు, పీఠనారాయణుం డల్ల వేమవిభుండు.”

కాశీఖండము. 1—37.

ii) “గోదావరి పావనోదకంబుల హేమ కలశితంబుల జలకమార్పు,

.....

.....
చామటించు శేషోపచారములను, సుభనాయకునకు పీఠభద్రగృహతి.”

అంబే. 1—48.

శ్రీనాథు డిందలి మొదటిపద్యము. నొక వేషమును, రెండవ పద్యమున నింకొకరి యర్చనమును వర్ణించుట ద్వారా ఆ యిర్వరి యొక్క పవిత్ర పూజోచిత వేషములను, ప్రవిమలాన్నితా పద్ధతిని సూచించి, ఆ యన్నదమ్ముల యన్యోన్యభావమును చమత్కారముగ ద్వనింపజేసియున్నాడు.

కార్యశీలులు, పంటపంశకములముత్రాలు నైస ఈ రాజశేఖరములు సౌందర్య, రాదర్యములు రెండును సాత్త్విక శాంభవతేజముచే సమున్మీషితములై సమకాలిన మూర్త్యాభిషిక్తుల కేర్పొందులందుకొన్నవి !

కందుకూరు క్షేత్రపతులు

కోమటిప్రోలారెడ్డి కుమారపంపకమున కడగొట్టువాడు, శ్రీరామచంద్రునకు రాక్షసస్వామివలె ప్రోలయవేమునకు రెడ్డిరాజ్యస్థాపనమున సహకరించిన సహోదరుడు, మాననీయ పరాక్రముడు మల్లారెడ్డి. ఈ మల్లసేనాపతి బాహదర్పము మెజయునటుల రచింపఁబడి జయించి, మోటుపల్లి యోడరేవును రెడ్డిరాజ్యమునకు గూర్చి, తన యన్నను భార్యసముద్రాధీశ్వరునిగా జేసిన పరాక్రమశాలి; మఱియు త్రిలింగక్షేత్రపై పరువడి రఱుతెంచిన అల్లాయుద్దీన్ బహమనీ సుల్తానుని యపార సేనలను అవక్రవిక్రమమున పాఱద్రోలి, రాజ్యమునకు రక్షణ కల్పించిన రఢినీనాథాగ్రణి.

ఈ సేనాని భుజబలమునందేగాక బుద్ధివైభవమునందును అందెవేసినచేయి యగు రాజనీతిజ్ఞుడు; విశేష విద్యావంతుడు; కవిశ్రయకవి యగు ప్రబంధపరమేశ్వరుని ఆతతశ్రీ కముపేతుని గావించి, అద్దంకియందలి తన యన్న యాస్థానము సలంకరింపజేసిన వితారనస్వీకృతిమనీయహృదయు వీరడు ! మఱియు నితడు చెదల్యాడలో సీతారామ రాక్షస ప్రతిష్ఠగావించిన పరిమళక్షుడు :

రెడ్డిరాజ్యపు దక్షిణప్రాంతమును పర్యవేక్షించు పాలకుడుగ ప్రోలయవేమునిచే సురుములూరి పుంతున¹ నియమితుడైన యీ మల్లచమూపతి యచిరకాలముననే వీర మరణము నొందగా. నాతని పంశీయులు స్కందపురి దుర్గమును కేంద్రముగా జేసికొని ఆ కందుకూరు ప్రాంత దేశమును పాలింపచొడగిరి. వీరిలో మల్లారెడ్డి క్షేష్ఠ పుత్రుడగు రాజకోమటిరెడ్డి ప్రథముడు. ఈ వినకోమటి కుమారు లేవురియం దగ్రగణుడు, కందుకూరు రాజ్యపాలకు లందరియం దగ్రగణుడునై నవాడు శ్రీగిరి రెడ్డి. ఈ శ్రీ గిరి కాలమునుండి యీ రాజ్యము స్పష్టమగు స్వతంత్రప్రతిపత్తి తోడి ప్రత్యేకరాజ్యముగా బరగజొచ్చినది. పంట కాఫీయులకు గురువీతమైన శ్రీమత్ ఘోడియరాయవంశమునకు జెందిన శ్రీగిరి, యీ శ్రీగిరి మొక్కగురువర్యుడు.

ఈ స్కందపురీకుడు కొండవీటివలన కొమారగిరికి సమకాలికుడేగాక సంగీత సాహిత్యాది వివిధరంగములయందు సమస్కంధుడుగ గూడ గన్నట్లుచున్నాడు. ఆతనివలె సీతకును సంగీత సాహితీ సౌందర్యజ్ఞుడైన విద్వాంసుడు; విమర్శకుడు; 'కలావాన్' బిరుదాంబితుడు; హేమాద్రి

[1. ఇది నేటి కడపమండలమునందలి సిద్ధిపతము తాలుకాలో ఉడుము లూరు నువేర నున్నది. vide రెడ్డి సూచిక. p. 33.

దాన చింతామణి యగు మహాదాత. ఈ చండనేతి సహస్రాబ్ది సమాస గాంధీర్వముగల మహా తటాఃములను పెక్కింటిని త్రవ్వించి ప్రజాజీవన సౌభాగ్యమునకు ప్రకృష్టముగ పాటుపడిన పరిపాలకుడు.

ఈ కందుకూరి రాజ్యముపై నొకవరి బహ్మనీ తురుష్కనైస్యములు దండెత్తిరాగా ఆ సేనావాహీనుల నీతని పెదతమ్ముడు రాచవేముడు హరి(అశ్వ)జల సహాయుడై విజృంభించి పాటద్రోలెను. “యుద్ధరంగమునుండి వెనుకంజవేయ” మని శపథమొనరించి నిలిచిన ఆ సంశప్త చిలములను జయించుటలో రాచవేమునకు, తమ్ములగు మాచారెడ్డి-II ప్రభృతులు బాసటయొందుడిరి. ఈ రాచవేముడు తనయన్నయగు శ్రీగిరి రెడ్డి పుణ్యమునకై బద్దెపూడిలో కందుకూరి జన్మాన దేవునకు ఒక చెఱుపు త్రవ్వించెను.

శ్రీగిరియనంతరము ఆతని రెండవతమ్ముడగు మాచారెడ్డి-II యొక్క కుమారుడు కోమటిరెడ్డి-II కందుకూరు రాజ్యము నేలెను. ఇతడు కొమరగిరి పాలనముయొక్కచివరి కాలమున, కొండపీటి కుటుంబ కలహముల యదనున (క్రీ.శ. 1403 ప్రాంతమున) ఆ సామ్రాజ్యపు దక్షిణ భాగమున కొంతమేర ఆక్రమించి, అందలి పెదపూడి యను గ్రామమును ఎల్లేపెద్ది లక్ష్మణ దీక్షితుడు, షడ్తర్కనాల వల్లభయజ్ఞు అను నిర్బర్హు సంస్కృత విద్వాంసుల కగ్రహారముగా నొసంగెను.

ఈ సమయముననే శ్రీగిరియొక్క యింకొక సోదరుడు అన్నారెడ్డి, అతని కుమారుడు మల్లారెడ్డి-III యు క్రీ.శ. 1404 ప్రాంతమున, విజయనగరసామ్రాజ్యాంతః కలహముల యవకాశమున ఉచయగిరి రాజ్యమందలి పొత్తపినాడు (సిద్ధవటముసీమ), పులుగులనాడు (చంద్రగిరిసీమ) ల నాక్రమించి టంగుటూరు, లేపాక, రాచపేడు (రాయచోటి) మున్నగు దుర్గములపై స్వతంత్రాధిపత్యము నెఱపిరి.

ఇదేకాలమున, శ్రీగిరి సెల్వరు కుమారులలో నొకడగు మల్లారెడ్డి-II కందుకూరు రాజ్యములోని చుండిని కేంద్రముగా జేసికొని, సోదరసమేతుడై యా ప్రాంతమును పరిపాలించెను. ఈ శ్రీగిరిమల్లారెడ్డి చుండియందు జనార్దనస్వామిని ప్రతిష్ఠించి, ఆ స్వామి యాలయమునకు మండప ప్రాకార గోపురాదికములను నిర్మింప జేసెను; మరియు నా స్వామికి అనేకనువర్తాలంకారములను, నిత్యతైంకర్యాదులకై యనేక భూములను సమర్పించెను.

కోమటి రెడ్డి-II యనంతర మతని రెండవకుమారుడు శివలింగారెడ్డి స్కందపురి రాజ్యమును పాలించెను. ఇతడు కందుకూరు రాజన్యులలో పేర్కొనదగిన సంస్కృత విద్వాంసుడు. హరదత్తాచార్యకృతమగు “గిరీశశ్రుతి (స్తుతి) సూక్తిమాల” యను స్తోత్రగ్రంథమునకు “తత్త్వప్రకాశిక” యను ఉత్తమ వ్యాఖ్య నీ తేడు రచించెను. ఇతడు అనవరతాష్టాంగయోగ పవిత్రితాంతరంగుడు; సత్పరిత్రాణచంగుడు; నాట్య శాస్త్ర ప్రణేత

యగు భరతమునియొక్క మతమునకు పతంగుడు (సూర్యుడు). ఈ తేదిచే పోషించబడిన విద్యత్కవులలో కవివాదిభేరుండబిరుదాంచుడుగు ఈశ్వరభట్టు ప్రథమగణ్యుడు. ఈ శివలింగభూపతి తనపెదకాతయగు శ్రీ గిరివలెనే పరమశివభక్తుడగు ప్రౌఢ విద్వాంసుడు. ఈతనియనంతరము, శ్రీగిరి కొమరుడైన కోమటి రెడ్డి-III చివరికాలమున క్రీ.శ. 1430 నాటికి ఈ కందుకూరు రాజ్యము విజయనగర సామ్రాజ్యమున విలీనమయ్యెను.

ఈ కందుకూరు క్షీణితతుల శాసనములన్నియు అనేక చటాక దేవాలయాది నిర్మాణములకు, ఆ యాదేవతల అంగరంగభోగములకు, అక్షరచణుల సుఖజీవనమునకు వారొసంగిన భూదానములను ప్రకటించునవియే : ఇట్లు ఈ దానశాసనములు, ఈ మల్లరథినీశాన్వయుల ఆర్జసంస్కృతీసమద్ధరణ మహనీయాశయమును ప్రతిబింబించు “అక్షరాదర్శము”లై అలరారుచున్నవి.

సింహాచలోత్సవము

ప్రోలయవెముడు మొదలుకొని ఆల్లయవేముని ఎరకుగల ఈ రాజన్య లల్లరును పరిపాలించినది ఒకటిన్నర శతాబ్ది మాత్రమే యయినను స్ఫూర్తిమంతమగు ఆ పరిపాలనము తెలుగుజాతియొక్క వివిధజీవనరంగములపై తరతరములకు తరుగని ప్రభావమును బరపినది. అశ్వపతి, నరపతి, గజపతు లనెడు ముగ్గురు రాజులకును మోహంబు పుట్టించు నట్టి సారవంతమగు పినాకినీ కృష్ణా గౌతమీ పరీవాహక ప్రదేశమును అవక్రపరాక్రములై యేలుచు, అవకాశమునకై పొంచియున్న ఆ మువ్వరు శత్రువులతోపాటు, పొరుగుననున్న రాజకొండ వెలమ మన్నీలతోడి కుటుంబవైరమును గలిగి, యనవరతము తలస్థించుచుండిన పోరాటములలో పాల్గొనుచునే, హిందూధర్మమును, ఆర్షవాఙ్మయమును సమద్ధరించి పోషించిన వీరి సంకల్పసత్యము కరము శ్లాఘ్యము. “శత్రు రేవ హి శత్రు స్సాస్యత్, ధర్మ శత్రు ర్న చస్యచిత్” (శత్రువు శత్రువే యైనను ఆతడు ప్రోదిసేయు ధర్మము మాత్ర మెవ్వరికిని శత్రువు కాదు.) అనునదే వారందరి యానాటి ధర్మకార్యము లన్నింటికి ఆదర్శవాక్యమై (motto) యలరినది. ఈ యమలినాదర్శమే ప్రత్యర్థుల కొల్వకూటములనుండి యేతెంచిన పండితవద్యులకును అగ్రహారాది ఘనసన్మానముల నందింపజేసినది. మఱియు, అదియే ఆశత్రుత్వమును స్పర్ధగమార్చి, సారస్వత క్షేత్రమున సత్ఫలితములను సృజించినది :

శ్రీకైలమునుండి సింధువువరకు, సింహపురినుండి సింహాచలవర్యంతము విస్తరించిన రాజ్యము నేలినట్టి, వారి శాసనములలో నించుమించుగ నన్నియు దానశాసనములే. “వావిలో తామ్ర శాసనము లధికసంఖ్యాకములు. ఆ తామ్ర శాసనము లన్నియు వారు ఆయా పుణ్య కాలములయందు ‘సరేసస్కృత విద్వాంసులకు ధారాదత్తము గావించిన యగ్రహారములను, పృథ్వులను పేర్కొనునవే : అట్లనేక విద్యత్కుటుంబములకు వారొసంగిన యపరిమిత భూదానముల వలననే ఆర్షవిద్య లాంధ్రావనిలో పారంపర్యముగ పరిధవిల్లగల్గినవి.

విద్యాధికారి పదవి స్వహామము, పసంతోక్షవ సంప్రదాయ పునరుద్ధరణము - అను రెండు ప్రకృష్ట కార్యముల వలన ఆనాడు గీర్వాణ వాఙ్మయమునకు, తత్ప్రభావితములు, తరచుసారియై, తత్తుల్యపీఠి నలంకరించిన ఆంధ్రవాఙ్మయమునకును అద్వితీయ చైతన్య స్ఫూర్తి అందింపబడినది. శత, సహస్రాద్యవధానములు, సారస్వత జైత్రయాత్రలు, స్వర్ణాభిషేకములు-మున్నగునవి ఆజాలగోపాలము నలరజేయు వాఙ్మయ ప్రపంచ విశేషములుగా ఆంధ్రమున అవిరళ ప్రచారము నొందిన దానాటి నుండియే : మణిచే కంకణము, కంకణముచే మణి, ఈరెంటిచే హస్తము ప్రకాశించినటుల ఆ నాటి కవిమండలచే ఆ రాజులు, ఆ రాజులచే నా కవిపుంగవులును, ఆ కవిరాజులు, రాజకవులుభయులచే ఆంధ్రావనియు ప్రకాశితములై, భాసించినవి.

రెడ్డిరాజులు వృషకేతనులు; వృషకేతనపదాజ్ఞారాధకులు. వారి దుర్గములు ధరణికి తోటలు; ధాన్యవాటికలు; ధనదాతృములు. వారి మందిరములు ఆదిలక్ష్మీ కామేశ్వరీ నిలయములగు 'గృహరాజ' సౌధములు. వారి భవనములు 'జై'లోక్యవిజయము'లు. వారు త్రవ్వించిన తటాకములు అనేక సస్యభరప్రళయములగు 'సంతాన సాగరము'లు. వారి వారుపములు 'రాజకుంజ' సింహము'లు. హేమాద్రిదాన చింతామణులు, సర్వజ్ఞ చక్రవర్తులు నయిన వారల కృతిత్వములును చింతామణులే : వారి వ్యాఖ్యలు సదర్శవస్తు సందర్శకములగు దీపికలు : తత్త్వప్రకాశిలు : వారి యాస్థాన కవీశ్వరులు వాఙ్మయప్రపంచవిజేత లగు సకల విద్యత్కవిసార్వభౌములు. శ్రీశైల సింహశైలములే వారి జయస్తంభములు : కీర్తికామన లేని ధృతర్షిత. సత్పాదానములను సంతృప్తి, నిరాదంబరశిల్ప రామణీయకమునెడల నితాంతాదరము - అనునవి వారి స్వభావసారాంశ సల్లక్షణములు. వేయేల ? వారి మూర్తిమత్త్వనిరూపణమునెడల శంభుదాసుడు, ఈశ్వరార్చనకళాశిలుడు. శివలీలావిలాసుడు - అను మువ్వర్షుల కవీశ్వరుల పల్కులే మొట్టమొదటి మూదలు :

మనసారసన్నిభసమాఖ్యులగు ఈ రాజన్యులెల్లరును ఉత్సాహశక్తి సమన్వితులగు నుత్తమవీరులే యైనను. ఈ వీరము, వీరిలో నొక్కొక్క కొందరియందుగల విశిష్టగుణమును పురస్కరించుకొని యొక్కొక్క విధముగ వీరముగ ప్రత్యేక ప్రాశస్త్యము వహించినది. అట్లు, వీరిలో ప్రోలయవే, మానవోత సృపతులు ధర్మవీరులు. అనవే, మల్లయవేమ, వీరభద్రులు దానవీరులు. కుమారగిరి శ్రీగిరులు దయావీరులు మల్లచమూప, కాటయవేమ, కోమటివేములు యుద్ధవీరులు. వీరందరిలోను వేమభూపాల పంచకము విశిష్టతరము.

ఆ కాలమున ఆంధ్రదేశమున శృంగగిరిపీఠమువంటి ధార్మిక గురుపీఠములు లేకున్నను, గీర్వాణవాఙ్మయాభ్యుదయము ద్వారా ఆర్షధర్మప్రబోధము ప్రచురముగా జరిగి యుండుటకు ఈ పాలకుల ధర్మాభిరతియే ముఖ్యహేతువు. ఈ తీవ్రధర్మోద్ధరణాకాంక్ష కతముననే వీరు సంస్కృతసారస్వతపోషణమును తమ ప్రధాన కర్తవ్యముగా స్వేచ్ఛతో స్వీకరించి, సమర్థవంతముగ నిర్వహించిరి.

కాక తీయానంత రకాలమున ఆర్ష సంస్కృతీలతకు వారట్లు ప్రసాదించిన పునరుజ్జీవనమే నేటికిని, రేపటికిని, ఉత్తమాదేశమై, ఉజ్జ్వలాదర్శమై దీపించుచున్నది. ప్రతివిషయమునను ప్రాచీనానుసరణము, నూతనవివరణము విలసిల్లిన ఈ రెడ్డిరాజుల కాలము, సాంఘికముగ ప్రజాయుగమై, రాజకీయముగ హైందవధర్మ పునరుజ్జీవన యుగమై, ఆర్థికముగ స్వచ్ఛయుగమై, వాఙ్మయ రంగమున రసవద్యాభ్యాసయుగమై రాజిల్లినది :

పంచారామపవిత్రతమైన త్రిలింగధరణీయందు, తమ పాలనమును వాఙ్మయమునకు వసంతవేళగా వర్ణిల్లజేసి, సాత్త్వికశైవశ్రీ రంజితమగు శాశ్వత సారస్వత సామ్రాజ్యమును స్థాపించిపోయిన ఆ ధూపాలకగ్రామణులయొక్క విశిష్ట ధార్మిక కీర్తి మూర్తిమత్త్వమును దర్శింపజేయుచున్న ఈ క్రింది శాసనశ్లోక మిందవశ్యాను సందేయము :

“శ్రీ శైలే స్థిరమూలతా ముపగతా
వ్యాప్తిం కుమారాచలే
పంచారామతలే ప్రతాన సుషమా
సింహాచలేంద్రే తతః |

శ్రీ మాతౌ పురుషోత్తమే కుసుమితా
యద్ధర్మ కీర్తిర్లతా
కాశ్యాం విశ్వవతేః పురః ఫలవతీ
నిత్యోపహరోచితమ్ ||”¹²

12. “రెడ్డిరాజ్యముల ధర్మకీర్తిలత శ్రీశైలములో స్థిరముగా వేరూని, త్రిపురాంతకముః వ్యాప్తినొంది, పంచారామములలో పైకెగ్గబాకి పండిరి యల్లుకొని విస్తరించి, సింహాచల, శ్రీకుంధ్ర, పురుషోత్తమ (పూర్వ) షేత్రములయందు పుష్పించి, శ్రీకాళీ విశ్వనాథుని సన్నిధిని నిత్యనైవేద్యమున కుచితముగా ఫలించినది.”

- i) అనవేముని పెద్దచెఱుకూరు శాసనము. Vide. ఆంధ్రుల చరిత్రము, Part 3, P. 177.
- ii) పెడకోమటివేముని రుద్రనరం శాసనము. Vide శృంగారశ్రీనాథము, P. 127 & అనుబంధము, P. 18.

ఆధార గ్రంథములు :

1. ఆంధ్రుల చరిత్రము — తృతీయ భాగము (1916): చిలుకూరి వీరభద్రరావు.
2. శృంగార శ్రీనాథము (1928): వేటూరి ప్రభాకర శాస్త్రి.
3. కాకతీయ సంచిక (1985): సం॥ మారేమండ రామారావు.
4. రెడ్డి సంచిక (1947): సం॥ వడ్డాది అప్పారావు.
5. History of The Reddi Kingdoms (1948): M. Somasekhara Sarma.
6. రెడ్డిరాజుల చరిత్రము (1981): చిలుకూరి పాపయ్య శాస్త్రి.

शुक सम्प्रदाय के कृष्ण

चरणदासों पन्थ योग का वंणव पन्थ समझा जाता है, परन्तु इसका मुख्य साधन हठयोग — संवर्लित — राजयोग है। उपासना में यह राधाकृष्ण की भक्ति करते हैं, परन्तु योग की मुख्यता होने से हम इसे योग मत का ही पन्थ मानते हैं। इस पन्थ के प्रथम आचार्य श्री शुकदेवजी हैं। चरणदासजी को श्री शुकदेवजी के दर्शन हुए और उन्होंने चरणदास को अपना शिष्य बनाया और योग की शिक्षा दी। श्री चरणदास का जन्म संवत् १७६० है।¹

चरणदासजी को इस योग साधना से शान्ति न मिली। भगवत्प्रेम में व्याकुल भक्त को इन सिद्धियों से कोई प्रयोजन नहीं होता। भगवान् कृष्ण के विरह में व्याकुल चरणदासजी उनके दर्शनार्थ श्री वृन्दावन धाम सेवा कुन्ज की ओर चल पड़े। भक्तवत्सल भगवान् ने चरणदास को अनन्य प्रेमी तथा निष्कामी भक्त समझकर उनकी निष्ठानुसार युगल स्वरूप से दर्शन दिया और उन्हें हृदय से लगाकर प्रेमाभक्ति के प्रचार की आज्ञा दी और अन्तर्ध्यान हो गये।²

ब्रह्म के अनन्त अवतारों में २४ अवतार मुख्य हैं। इन चौबीसों अवतारों में राम और कृष्ण पूर्ण कला से अवतरित हुए हैं। कृष्ण ने पूर्ण कला से प्रकट होकर कंस को पछाड़ा। यही गोपाल कृष्ण चरणदास के इष्टदेव हैं।³

1. हिन्दुत्व (लेखक: श्री रामदास गौड़, प्रथम संस्करण) पृष्ठ. ७०७-७०८.

2. कल्याण (सन्त अंक प्रथम खण्ड) पृष्ठ. ६४१.

3. नाम भेद किरिया अनन्त, अनन्त धरे अवतार।

चार बीस तिनमें अधिक, कहे शुकदेव विचार।

रामकृष्ण पूरण कला, चौबीसों में दोय।

निर्गुण से सरगुण वही, भक्तों कारण होय ॥ भक्ति सागर, पृष्ठ १७७.

पूरण ईश तिहुँपुर को कृष्ण प्रगट हो कंस पछार ॥ भक्ति सागर, पृष्ठ १७७.

चरणदास के इष्ट कृष्ण गोपाल हैं। दुख हरण सुख करन सुदीन दयाल हैं

— भक्ति सागर, कुरक्षेत्र लीला, ५११.

इन्हीं पूर्ण ब्रह्म कृष्ण का स्वरूप माखन चोरी लीला में श्री चरणदास ने इस प्रकार लिखा है :-

जुगता धरि ध्यान धरें जिसको, तपसी, तन गारि के खार लगावें ।
 चारसु वेदन पावत भेद, बडे तिरदेव नहीं गति पावें ।
 आकाश पताल मृत्युलोक ही में, जाको नाम लिए सब ही शिर नावें ।
 चरणदास कहें ताकू गोप सुता, करतारी दे दे नाच नचावें ।

लीला है अनंत नाम रूप हैं अनंत जाके, शक्ति है अनन्त वार पार हू न पायो है । महिमा अपार रहे देव मौन धार मुख, जै जै उचार निज शीश हू नवायो है । ब्रह्मा से अनंत सौं वेद की उचार करें, नारद अनंत जाको गुणवाद गायो हैं । कहें चरणदास सोई नंद को दुलारो प्यारों दे दे नवनीत वृज वालन नचायो है ।

— चरनावत वैष्णव वर्षोत्सव - पृष्ठ ९२, पद ११८.

चरणदासजी का सुप्रसिद्ध ग्रन्थ भक्तिसागर है, इसमें कृष्ण की भी लीलाओं का वर्णन किया गया है, जिनमें चीर हरण लीला, दानलीला, माखन चोरी लीला, काली नाथन लीला और कुरुक्षेत्र लीला आदि मुख्य हैं । चरणदास जी के कृष्ण का स्वरूप हमें इन्हीं लीलाओं के आधार पर समझना होगा ।

चरणदास के कृष्ण

श्री चरणदास जी कृष्ण को “अन्तरयामी” और “भगवान्” मानते थे ।

तव बोले अन्तरयामी अन्तर उधार,
 ले ले जावो वस्त्र एहो व्रज की नार....
 तन मन मांही रमे कृष्ण भगवान्,
 प्रीति की परीक्षा करी नन्द जू के कान ।

— भक्तिसागर, चीर हरण लीला, पृष्ठ २३२.

चरणदास के शब्दों में श्रीकृष्ण अपना वैभव प्रकट करते हुए गोपियों से कहते हैं :-

तीन लोक चौदह भुवन और सकल विस्तार,
मेरे मुख की डाढ़ में सदा रहे निरधार ।

— भक्तिसागर, दान लीला, पृष्ठ ४८६.

इन वंशी मोहे सर्व, ब्रह्मा और महेश,
सुरनर मुनि सनकाद हूँ, इन्द्रादिक नारद शेष ।

— भक्तिसागर, दान लीला, पृष्ठ ४८७.

कोट कोट ब्रह्माण्ड हैं, रोम रोम के मांहि,
ऐसी है यह कामरी, जाकू जोगी देख लुभाहि ।

— भक्तिसागर, दान लीला, पृष्ठ ४८७.

जो कृष्ण इतने वैभवशाली हैं, उन्हें गोपियां कथा समझती हैं । वे कहती

कहा कहें घर जाय के, सुन हो नन्द किशोर ।
ते लूटयो सगरो दही, और भांडे डारे फोर ॥

— भक्तिसागर, दान लीला, पृष्ठ ४८९.

अन्त में गोपियों और कृष्ण में स्नेह बढ़ता है :—

अरस परम झगरे सरस, नेह बढ़यो दोउ ओर,
केलि करें ब्रज नागरी, नट नागर कुंवर किशोर ।

— भक्तिसागर, दान लीला, पृष्ठ ४८९.

जिन कृष्ण को गोपियाँ एक नटखट बालक समझती हैं और यशोदा को उलहना⁴ देती हैं, उन्हीं कृष्ण को चरणदासजी पूर्ण पुरुष अनादि ईश तीन लोक

4. एक कहें मेरे घर धस्यो, माखन दियो लुटाय
एक कहें मेरे शीश से, गागर दई ढरकाय
एक कहें गहि चीर हार हियें ते मेरा झटकी
एक कहें दधि भाठ चाट धरती पर पटको ।

— भक्तिसागर, माखन चोरी लीला, पृष्ठ ४९०.

का स्वामी एवं घट घट व्यापक अन्तरयामी समझते हैं।⁵ चरणदास जी कृष्ण के लोक रक्षक स्वरूप के दर्शन करते हैं। तभी तो वे ग्वाल वालों के रक्षार्थ कालीदह में कूद पड़ते हैं।⁶कृष्ण को कालीदह में कूदने से डर नहीं, क्योंकि उन्होंने कन्स के अनेक दूतों को परास्त किया था।⁷यह कालीनाग को नाथने वाले कृष्ण त्रिभुवन के स्वामी हैं। एवं निर्भय पद और मुक्ति को देनेवाले हैं। इन कृष्ण की चरण रज को सनकादिक खोजते फिरते हैं।⁸ यह कृष्ण करुणा के सिन्धु और कृपा के सागर हैं।⁹कृष्ण के लोक रक्षक स्वरूप का वर्णन गोपियाँ आपस में करती हैं।¹⁰

5. पूरण पुरुष अनादि ईश तिहुपुर की स्वामी
घट घट व्यापक होय रहो, हरि अन्तरयामी
ताके कौतुक बहुत हैं, कंह ली कंह बखान
चरणदास, सुखदेव ने, कद्यो भागोत पुरान

— भक्तिसागर, माखन चोरी लीला, पृष्ठ ४९०.

6. एक समय हरि चिन्ता कीनी, विषधर अति दुखदाई ।
ग्वाल बच्छ जल पीवन जावे, तिनकु बहुत सताई
वा काली को गर्ब निवारुं, जल से काढ़ निकारुं
चरणदास हरि कियो मनोरथ, जल निर्मल कर डारुं ।

— भक्तिसागर, कालीनाथन लीला, पृष्ठ ४९२.

7. अहो मात सुन बात हमारी, धीर धरो मन माहीं ।
किन्ते कन्स के दूत पछारे, वारुं भय कुछ नाहीं ॥

— भक्तिसागर, कालीनाथन लीला, पृष्ठ ४९३.

8. अहोनाथ त्रिभुवन के स्वामी, तुमको जो जन धावे ।
चरणदास कहे मुक्त होय कर, सो निर्भय पद पावे ॥ ...
...जा रज को सनकादिक धारैं, सो याके सिर लागी ।

— भक्तिसागर, कालीनाथन लीला, पृष्ठ ४९४.

9. करुणासिन्धु कृपा को सागर दुख की मेटन हारो
काली नथन श्याम जू करके, काली नाथ कहाये ।
चरणदास कहें हरी दर्शन सो, वृज जन आनन्द पाये

— भक्तिसागर, कालीनाथन लीला, पृष्ठ ४९५.

10. दूत दले बहु कंस केरी, अरी हेली हमरी करी सहाय
इन्दर वरष्यो कोप सों, जव हम लिये वचाय ।

— गोपी विरह निवेदन (भक्तिसागर), पृष्ठ ४९७.

चरणदास जी कृष्ण के लोक रक्षक वीर स्वरूप का वर्णन करते हैं। कृष्ण द्वारा पूतना वध सुनकर कंस डर जाता है और श्रीकृष्ण श्रीधर ब्राह्मण के प्राण तो नहीं हरते हैं, किन्तु उसकी जीभ निकाल कर मरोड़ देते हैं।¹¹

चरणदास जी ने आत्म निवेदन करते हुए स्पष्ट कहा है :—

“तुम बिन मेरी कोई नाहीं। यह सखन सुन लीजै।”

इसी प्रकार मोहन को अपना साहव और अपने को मोहन की दासी बताया है।¹² यह दासी भाव से कृष्ण की उपासना का संकेत करता है।

चरणदास जी ने गोपी विरह निवेदन में गोपी प्रेम और गोपी विरह का विस्तार से वर्णन किया है। उनके कृष्ण गोपियों में चन्द्रमा की तरह शोभायमान रहते हैं।¹³कृष्ण गोपियों से हंसते हंसाते हैं और उनकी बांह पकड़ते हैं और कृष्ण से मिलने के लिये गोपियों के हृदय में लालसा जागृत हो उठती है।¹⁴गोपियों को श्यामसुन्दर के विरह में कुछ भी नहीं सुहाता है।¹⁵कृष्ण के प्रेम में गोपियां वादली हो जाती हैं, व्याकुल और वेहाल हो जाती हैं।¹⁶ प्रेम का तीर लगने से गोपियों का रोम रोम घायल हो जाता है और कृष्ण के अतिरिक्त और कोई औषधि नहीं कर सकता है।¹⁷जब “विधृता” कृष्ण की वांसुरी

11. कृष्ण पूतना जब हरि मारी, सुनकर कंस डरायो
श्रीधर ब्राह्मण अपने घर को ताको वेग पठायो
... अन्तरायामी लठो अचानक, श्रीधर पकड़ पछारो
दे छाती पर जीभ भरोड़ी, नाहि जीब सूँ भारो
— भक्तिसागर, श्रीधर ब्राह्मण लीला, पृष्ठ ५०३.
12. तुम बिन हमरो कोऊ नाहीं, यह सरवन सुन लीजै
— भक्तिसागर, पृष्ठ ५०५.
13. सब सखियन में यो हरि राजे ज्यों तारन में चन्दा
— भक्तिसागर, पृष्ठ ५०४.
14. हंस हंसावे दूर सो मेरी गहे अकेले बांह,
बह मोपेमोहित भयो री, अरी हेली मेरी हू मन ललचाय —भक्तिसागर, पृष्ठ ४९८.
15. श्यामसुन्दर बिन कछु न सुहावे, कोई मिलावे नेरो री —भक्तिसागर, पृष्ठ ५०४
16. हूँ विरहिन बौरी भई, व्याकुल और वेहाल — “ ” ” ४९७
17. रोम रोम घायल भई, अरी हेली लगो प्रेम को तीर
कृष्ण वेद बिन को करे, औषधि की तदवीर — “ ” ” ४९९

को सुनकर अपने पति के वन्द कर देने के कारण रास लीला में नहीं पहुँच पाती है, तो वह अपना शरीर त्याग कर अपनी आत्मा द्वारा रासलीला स्थल पर पहुँच जाती है।¹⁸शरद पूर्णिमा को रासलीला होती है, जिसके कारण ब्रह्मा, ऋषि, मुनि और सनकादि मोह जाते हैं।¹⁹युगल उपासना के विषय में चरणदास जी ने लिखा है कि कृष्ण भगवान अपने हाथ से वेनी गुहने लगे, तब मैने (दासी भक्ति) ने दर्पण दिखा दिया, जिसके कारण राधा जी के मुख का प्रतिबिम्ब कृष्ण को और कृष्ण के मुख का प्रतिबिम्ब राधा जी की दिखाई पड़ा। चरणदास जी कहते हैं.... वह सुखमय क्षण सदैव बना रहे।²⁰राधाकृष्ण का अन्तिम मिलन कुरुक्षेत्र में होता है। भगवान कृष्ण नन्द जी के चरणों का स्पर्श करते हैं और व्रजवासियों से, जो जिस प्रकार मिलता है, उससे उसी प्रकार मिलते हैं।²¹कुरुक्षेत्र में राधा कृष्ण मिलने के समय राधा कृष्ण के चरण स्पर्श करती हैं और कृष्ण राधा के चरण स्पर्श करने की भावना करते हैं।²²

18. तब तो चली सवै बैनारी बाकी आशा त्यागी
तज के देह गई आगे ही, वह वनिता बड़भार्गी — भक्तिसागर, पृष्ठ ५०२
19. रास रच्यो नन्दलाल हेली, वृन्दावन के माहि
संग विराजे राधिका री, अरी हेली अपने प्रिय के नाल
मुरली मधुर बजाई रे, अरी हेली सुनत भई वेहाल
जेती व्रजवाला सवे, तन की रही न संभाल...
....शरद रेन अति सोहनी री, अरी हेली फेलो पूरन चन्द
चतुरानन मुनिजन रिषिन, मोहे सनक सनन्द
पशु पक्षी मृगहू थकेरी, अरी हेली शंकर छोड्यो ध्यान
बाड़ी निश शशिहू थ क्यो रंभा मूली तान — ,, ,, ४९९
20. दासि अपनी जान मोहन आप कर वेनी गुही
प्रीतम वेनी गुहन लागे, में सखी दरपन लियो
पीठ पाछे मुख छिपाकर, मंद मंद मुसका दियो
गुह चुके जब पीठ कर धरो हूँ सखी पाइन परी
जा समय पर गुही वेनी सदा रहियो वह धरी — ,, ,, ५०१.
21. तबही पकरे पांव नन्द के आयके, गदगद वाणी कंठ वात नहिं कह सके।
जिह नाते के लोग भांत बाही मिले — भक्तिसागर, कुरुक्षेत्र लीला, पृष्ठ ५२१.
22. उते रही गह पांय प्रीति अधिकार सों, सीस उठायो नाहि न देह संभार सों।
मनमें हरि तिय चरन को सीस निबाई, मस्तक दे बाही ठोर न फिर उठावई।
जब इह भावना भाव श्याम मनमें बरो, तब हरि पग ते कुंवर शीस म्यारो करो
...अति व्याकुल सब अंग परी मुरझाय के, यह गत देखी लाल लई उठि घाय के।
— भक्तिसागर (कुरुक्षेत्र लीला) पृष्ठ ५२३.

भगवान श्रीकृष्ण राधाजी का घूँघट खुलवाकर सर्व रानियों का गर्व दूर करते हैं ।²³वे स्पष्ट शब्दों में कहते हैं.....मुझे प्रसन्न करने के लिए राधा की उपासना करना चाहिये ।²⁴

राधा और कृष्ण की अभिन्नता का वर्णन करते हुए चरणदास जी लिखते हैं कि राधा गर्म दूध पीती हैं और कृष्ण के चरणों में छाले पड़ जाते हैं ।²⁵

भगवान कृष्ण कुरुक्षेत्र में गोपियों को ज्ञान का उपदेश देते हैं ।²⁶ कुरुक्षेत्र में एकत्रित राजा लोग कृष्ण को पूर्ण काम समझ का प्रार्थना करते हैं ।²⁷जिन कृष्ण को वसुदेव ने अपना पुत्र समझा, वे कृष्ण वास्तव में अन्तर्यामी हैं ।²⁸कुरुक्षेत्र में नारद जी ने वसुदेव को उपदेश देते हुए कृष्ण के कर्मयोग की ओर संकेत किया है ।²⁹राधा जी ने कृष्ण का स्वभाव बतलाते हुए सतभामा जी

23. तब हंस के घनश्याम घूँघट खुलवाइया, सब रानिन के रूप को गर्व घटाइया ।
— भक्तिसागर, पृष्ठ ५२८.
24. मन बच करके मौहि जु चाहे बस करे । श्री वृषभानु कुमारि की सेवा चितधरे ।
— भक्तिसागर, पृष्ठ ५२९.
25. राधा हमरे ध्यान सदा अभिलाखई, निशदिन चरन सरोज हिये मै राखई
तातो पीवत दूधपगन ऊपर परो, रुक्मिन ताते चरन हमारो हयां जरो ।
— भक्तिसागर, पृष्ठ ५३१.
26. तुमतो सुमरो मोहि सदा चित लाय के, हम रहि हैं तुम पास प्रीति के भाय के
आतम ही में रूप आत्मा देखिए, यह अध्यात्म ज्ञान हिये अब रेखिए ।
— भक्तिसागर, पृष्ठ ५३४.
27. रक्षाकरन धैन विप्र के तुम इहां, लीनो है औतार जगत के साइयां
आदि अन्त और मध्य संपूरन काम हो, तुमही को हम करत सदा परनाम हो ।
— भक्तिसागर, पृष्ठ ५३५.
तुम प्रभु पूरन काम कृपाल दयाल हो, पार ब्रह्म भगवान धरम के धाम हो
पार ब्रह्म प्रभू ईश हमारे हो तुमही, सब दासन के दास तुन्हारे हैं हमी ।
— भक्तिसागर, पृष्ठ ५४३.
28. सबही के घट मांहि रही इस भांति में, जैसे पावक रहत गुप्त सब काठ में
तुमको श्री वसुदेव नहि पहचानियां, पुत्र जान बहु भांत हिये हित मानियां ।
— भक्तिसागर, पृष्ठ ५४३.
29. जो कुछ पुत्र और दान सदा ही तुम करौ । नेम धर्म व्रत और जु कुछ मन में धरो
तिनको फल जो होय सु हरि कूँ दीजिए, इच्छा मन के मांहि कुछ नहि कीजिए
सो हरी तुमसो होय न न्यारो ज्ञानिये, सदा बसत गृह मांहि तुन्हारे मानिये ।
— भक्तिसागर, पृष्ठ ५४६.

से कहा — “कृष्ण भक्तवत्सल है”।³⁰ राधाजी ने नेम और प्रेम का भेद भी बतला कर कहा कि कृष्णा-प्रेम में नेम की आवश्यकता नहीं।³¹

कुरुक्षेत्र से कृष्ण राधा के साथ वृन्दावन को चले जाते हैं,³² और नित्य विहार आज तक वहाँ करते हैं।³³ अपना दूसरा स्वरूप प्रकट कर द्वारका भेज दिया।³⁴

इसी नित्य विहार में सखियों के मध्य स्थान प्राप्त कर चरणदास नित्य निरंतर रहने की अभिलाषा करते हैं।

आस पास बहु कुन्ज हैं, बीच लाल को धाम।

चरणदास कूँ दीजिए, सखियन में विसराम॥

.....

.....

.....

अखण्ड धाम लीला अमर, नित वृन्दावन रास।

नित विहार जहाँ होत है, चरणदास को वास।

— मध्ययुगीन हिन्दी साहित्य में कृष्ण (अप्रकाशित) १६६ - १६७.

विवेचन

चरणदास जी ने श्रीकृष्ण के लोक रक्षक और ऐश्वर्यमय स्वरूप को देखा है। श्रीकृष्ण के वीर स्वरूप का भी दर्शन कर दास्य भाव की उपासना की गई है। माधुर्य भाव की उपासना में यह दास्य भाव - दासी भाव के रूप में परलक्षित होता

30. जै प्रेमी जन हो हि सकल सिरमोर हैं, तिन पाछे ही फिरत जैसे चक्र डोर हैं।

— भक्तिसागर, पृष्ठ ५५१.

31. प्रेम नेम को भेद कछु नहीं जानई

जिह वन में सिंह राज विराजत प्रेम है, तिह वन तें गजराज ज्यों भाजत नेम है।

— भक्तिसागर, पृष्ठ ४४२.

32. गुप्त भई राधाकुँवर वृन्दावन आइया, श्री ब्रज दूल्ह कुँवर संग ही लाइया।

— भक्तिसागर, पृष्ठ ५५३.

33. तहां आयै बहु भांत सुभोगे भोग ही, नित विहार जहाँ होत जानत सबै लोग हैं।

— भक्तिसागर, पृष्ठ ५५४.

34. दूजो कृष्ण सरूप और परगट भयो, सो, रानी पठरानी देवकी संगगयो।

— भक्तिसागर, पृष्ठ ५५४.

है। चरणदास अपने को चरणदासी मानते हैं। राधा और कृष्ण अभिन्न हैं। कृष्ण की प्रसन्नता के लिए राधा की उपासना आवश्यक है। कृष्ण अन्तर्यामी और भक्तवत्सल हैं। राधाकृष्ण के नित्यविहार में सखियों के मध्य स्थान प्राप्त कर चरणदास नित्य निरन्तर रहने की अभिलाषा करने हैं।

सहजो वाई के कृष्ण

चरणदास जी के दो शिष्यायें हुईं सहजोवाई और दयावाई। अन्य सम्प्रदायों में जो स्थान करमावाई और मीरावाई का है, वही स्थान इस सम्प्रदाय में सहजोवाई का है।³⁵सहजो वाई का ग्रन्थ “सहज प्रकाश” है।³⁶

श्रीकृष्ण की लीला सम्बन्धी निम्नांकित पद प्राप्त हैं। इसी से श्री कृष्ण का स्वरूप समझा जा सकता है।

मुकुट लटक अट की मन माहीं।

नृत्यत नटवर मदन मनोहर, कृण्डल झलक पुलक विथुराई ॥ १

नाक बुलाक हलत मुक्ताहल, होठ मटक गति भौह चलाई।

टुमक टुमक पग घरत घरनि पर, बांह उठाय करत चतुराई ॥ २

झुनक झुनक नूपुर झनकारत, ताता थेई थेई रीझ रिझाई।

चरणदास सहजों हिय अन्तर, भवन करो जित रहौ सदाई ॥ ३

दयावाई के कृष्ण

श्री दयावाई ने “दया बोध” नामक ग्रन्थ लिखा है। इसमें एक अध्याय “प्रेम का अंग” है। ग्रन्थ छप गया है। इस ग्रन्थ में कहीं कहीं दयाकुंवर की भी छाप है। सम्भव हो सकता है कि अध्याय “प्रेम का अंग” में कृष्ण का कोई स्वरूप वर्णित हो, किन्तु लेखक को यह ग्रन्थ उपलब्ध नहीं है।

विवेचन

सहजों में प्रेम की प्रधानता है और दया में वैराग्य की। सहजों ने प्रेम विह्वल स्मरण को अपनाया तो दया ने सर्वस्व समर्पणमय वैराग्य को। सहजों के

35. श्री नव सन्तमाल, पृष्ठ २७, प्रथम संस्करण, सम्बत् १९९०.

36. “ २८ ”

प्रेम में वैराग्य का और दया के वैराग्य में प्रेम का आधार है।³⁷ सहजो वाई के कृष्ण नित्य विहारी हैं। वे नाचते हैं, नूपुर बजते हैं, लाल पर रीझते हैं और सहजों के हृदय में सदा मृत्यु करते हैं।

दास कुंवर के कृष्ण

लेखक के निजी संग्रहालय में “श्री चरणदास जी के शिष्य दासकुंवर की “बाणी सर्व अंग” नामक एक हस्त लिखित ग्रन्थ है, जिसे गोविन्द प्रसाद जी के पठनार्थ नेकराम तिवारी ने सम्वत् १८७८ में लिपि बद्ध किया था। उक्त ग्रन्थ में “गुरु अस्तुति का अंग” “साध अंग” “ज्ञान अंग” और “प्रेम अंग” हैं। इसके अन्तिम अध्याय “प्रेम अंग” में कृष्ण का स्वरूप इस प्रकार प्राप्य है —

कदम वृक्ष के नीचे त्रिभंगी कृष्ण खड़े मुरली बजा रहे हैं, जिनके आकर्षण से दधि बेचनेवाली ग्वालिनें घर की सुधि बुध खोकर स्वयं विक जाती हैं।³⁸

दासकुंवर ने कृष्ण विरह का विशद वर्णन किया है। विना कृष्ण के सेज सूनी प्रतीत होती है। पूर्ण चन्द्र और पवन की शीतलता मदन को दूना जाग्रत करते हैं।³⁹विना मोहन के कल नहीं पड़ती है। मदन गोपाल की शरणागत होने से काल से भी डर नहीं लगता। कृष्ण के मिलने पर पग पग पर होने वाले सभी दुख दूर हो जाते हैं।⁴⁰

दासकुंवर ने श्री कृष्ण का मुरलीधर एवं मदन विहारी रूप में चरित्र चित्रण किया है।

रूप माधुरी शरण के कृष्ण

वर्तमान समय में वृन्दावन में युगल घाट पर इस सम्प्रदाय का एक मन्दिर सरसकुन्ज के नाम से प्रख्यात है, जिसके अध्यक्ष श्री माधुरी शरण जी ने कई

37. कल्याण, सन्त अंक, पृष्ठ ६४४.

38. आज सणी बनवारी ठाठे कदमविरछ की छाँई
तिरभंगी मुख बैन बजावत राग मधुर सरगाई। 1८1

... दासकुंवर की बाणी हस्त लिखित पद संख्या ९, पृष्ठ ३०-३१.

39. दासकुंवर की बाणी, पद संख्या १०, पृष्ठ ३१.

40. ” ” २१, ३५.

पुस्तकें — श्री शुक सम्प्रदाय रहस्य, उपदेश चिन्तामणि, श्री शुक सम्प्रदाय प्रकाश, श्री नव सन्तमाल और श्री चरनावत वैष्णव वर्षोत्सव आदि लिखी हैं —

“श्री चरणदासजी को वृन्दावन के सेवाकुन्ज में श्री राधा कृष्ण के दर्शन साक्षात्कार भये, फिर युगल सरकार ने श्री चरणदास को निष्काम और अत्यन्त प्रेमी भक्त समझकर अनेक सखियों सहित नित्य रास के दर्शन कराये। कृपा समुद्र श्री कृष्ण ने श्री चरणदास जी को सखी भेष में आलिंगन इत्यादिक रस का आस्वादन कराया और फिर श्री चरणदासजी को संसार में प्रेमाभक्तिप्रचार करने की आज्ञा देकर युगल सरकार अन्तरध्यान होगये।”⁴¹

इस स्वरूप की पुष्टि निम्नांकित पंक्तियों से भी होती है —

युगल किशोर संग बहु सखियां । भक्तिराज देखे अप अंख्यां ।
ये तो उठ चरनन सों लाये । कृष्ण वांह गहि हृदय लगाये ।⁴²

— श्री गुरुभक्ति प्रकाश से.

“....दिव्य विग्रह श्री युगल सरकार विराजमान हैं और परम तत्व की हैं। जिनकी देह — ऐसी सखियाँ दिव्य वस्त्र भूषण पहिरे सन्मुख नृत्यगान कर रही हैं और श्री श्याम चरणदास जी भी सखी रूप हो गये। श्री ठाकुरजी ने राहिनी तरफ़ तो श्री चरणदास जी को, वाई तरफ़ श्री प्रियाजी को गलवाहीं दे के रास विलास का सुख दिया। जब आनन्द देख लिया तब श्री ठाकुर जी ने चरणदास जी से आज्ञा करी — ये ही ध्यान हिये मैं धरना, मैं तो तुम्हारे पास ही ।”⁴³....और एक बार पुनःअष्ट सखियों सहित राधाकृष्ण के दर्शन भये।”⁴⁴

41. सेवाकुन्ज विहारिणं यदुपति राधायुतं दृष्टवान् ।

...
...
...

— श्री शुक सम्प्रदाय, पृष्ठसंख्या, क-ख.

42. नव सन्तमाल, पृष्ठ १२-१३.

43. ,, ,, ,, १४.

44. ,, ,, ,, १५.

कृष्ण ने नित्य विहार में अखण्ड रूप धारण कर लिये हैं । अजपादास जी लिखते हैं :-

“अनगिन रूप धरे अति बांके रास अखण्डा नित्य विहार ।”⁴⁵

लक्षदास जी प्रार्थना करते हैं कि मुझे दम्पति विहार के दर्शन होते रहें ।

“लक्षदास दम्पति विहार सुख लखत रहूं, अरजी हमारी

आगे मरजी हुजूर की ।”⁴⁶

इस सम्प्रदाय में नित्य किशोर श्रीकृष्ण की उपासना होती है ।

“नित्य किशोर उपासना दीनी । चरणदास हिरदय घर लीनी ।”⁴⁷

“श्री लाल लडैती निकुंज धाम में काहू समय विपरीत शृंगार धारण कियाश्री लाल जी के मुकुट कुण्डल आदि श्री स्वामिनी जी ने धारण किये और श्री लाल जी का तिय भेष शोभायमान होता भया । ...वे ही श्यामला मखी श्री शुकदेव हैं ।”⁴⁸

इस सम्प्रदाय में राधाकृष्ण के युगल स्वरूप उपासना का वर्णन मिलता है :-

“गौरांगी श्री राधिका प्रीतम की उरहार ।

मन मोहन मन मोहनी परम कृपालु उदार ॥

जीवन धन श्री कृष्ण की, कृष्ण प्राण आधार ।

कृष्ण चित्त वस करन नित कृष्ण करत मनहार ॥⁴⁹

दे गलवैया श्याम पिया संग दरशो यमुना तीर ।⁵⁰

श्री कृष्ण का युगल स्वरूप ही इस सम्प्रदाय में प्राप्य है :-

“राधेश्याम प्यारे से बोलो, दिल की शरम सकुच सब खोलो ।⁵¹

45. ,, ,, ,, ६९.

46. ,, ,, ,, १०१.

47. श्री शुक महत्व, पृष्ठ ५९.

48. ,, ,, ,, ४५-४९.

49. उपदेश चिन्तामणि, पृष्ठ ३९-४०.

50. ,, ,, ,, १२४.

51. ,, ,, ,, १२७.

“अब नाहीं भावत और कट्खरी, चित अटके दोऊ रसिया ।⁵²

मन में बसे रहत हैं निशि दिन, राधा कुंज विहारी ।⁵³

अब मेरी सुरत श्याम रंग पागी ।...

...लागी मेरी मदन मोहन से यारी ।

मुकुट लटक अटकी उर अन्तर सब से सुरता टारी ।⁵⁴

युगल लाल के रूप सिन्धु में सुरता कूद पड़ी ।....

जब से मन में बस गई बांकी अदा धन श्याम की ।⁵⁵

जै मिलादे श्याम ताकी दासी हूं विन दाम की ।

नन्द नन्दन भक्त वन्दन प्राण जीवन है मेरा

विन मिले नन्दलाल के मैं ना किसी के काम की ।

तन में मन में बस रहा है, रूप प्रीतम श्याम का ।⁵⁶

उत्सव के पदों में विभिन्न अवसरों पर राधा और कृष्ण की झांकी हमें प्राप्त होती है । झूलते हुए श्यामा श्याम, फूल सिंहासन पर शोभायमान युगल सरकार, लताकुंज में विहार करते हुए राधाकृष्ण, रथारूढ़ युगल जोड़ी एवं फूल के बंगले में राधा मोहन के विभिन्न स्वरूपों का वर्णन मिलता है ।

देखी आलीझूलत युगल किशोर

पुष्पन की पटड़ी पैगड़ी श्यामा श्याम चितचोर ।⁵⁷

झूले में राधाकृष्ण झूल रहे हैं :-

“आली देखी झूलत जुगलकिशोर ।

पुष्पन रचित हिंडौरा मांहि राजत श्यामल गोरा ।⁵⁸

52. उपदेश चिन्तामणि, पृष्ठ १२८.

53. „ „ „ १२९.

54. „ „ „ १३०.

55. „ „ „ १३१.

56. „ „ „ १३२.

57. „ „ „ १३५.

58. „ „ „ १३६.

वन विहरत दोड़ प्रीतम प्यारी ।
 दे गलवैया प्यारी के पिये अधरन मुरली धरी ।
 लख मुख चन्द श्याम श्यामा को, मुख बलिहारी ।⁵⁹

फूल सिंहासन पर श्यामा श्याम विराजमान हैं :—

फूल सिंहासन मोहन श्यामा दोड़ गलवैया डारी ।
 रूप सिन्धु दोड़ लाल लडेती छवि पर तन मन वारी ।⁶⁰

लता कुन्जों में राधाकृष्ण विहार कर रहे हैं :—

लतन तर बैठे युगल विहारी ।
 चन्दन सिंहासन पै राजे दाऊ गलवैया डारी ।
कोऊ सखी बिझना डोरत कर से कोऊ दे पान सुपारी ।⁶¹

स्थारूढ राधा कृष्ण का वर्णन :—

आवत रथ चढ़ आज युगलवर
 फूल श्रृंगार सजै अंग अंगन श्री राधा नट नागर गिरधर
 फूल ही को रथ अश्व फूल उर चालत हृदय अति ही हरष भर ।
 फूल ही चवर मोछल लीने फूलन की लिये छरी सखी कर ।⁶²

आज राधा कृष्ण की युगल जोरी कालिन्दी के सुरम्य कूलों पर विहार कर रही है । श्री राधा मोहन फूलों के बंगले में विराजमान हैं....

“आज सखी बनी है अनोखी गोरी
 कालिन्दी के कूल मनोहर विहरत निज रुचि सोरी ।
 फूलन के बंगले में राजें मोहन राधा गोरी ॥⁶³
 फूलन को वेनी टीका नथ सोहे फूलन की ।
 झूलन को हार हिय श्याम पह्नायो है ।

59. " " " १३६.

60. " " " १३७.

61. " " " १३८.

62. " " " १३८.

63. " " " १३९.

फूलन के बंगले में राजे दोऊ गौर श्याम,
फूल शृंगार आज पिया ने सजायो है ।⁶⁴

गले में बाहें डाल कर युगल जोड़ी लता भवन में बैठी है :-
आज सखी री लता भवन में बैठे दोउ पिये प्यारी है ।
रस वस मृद मुसक्यात मनोहर गल में बैया डारी हैं ।⁶⁵

झूला झूलने का भी एक दृश्य प्रस्तुत किया गया है :-
हेली दोऊ झूलत कदम की छैया,
रतन जटित पटरी पर राजें हिलमिल दे गलवैया ।
हंस हंस झोंटा देत आली री, मन रोम रोम पुलकैया ।⁶⁶

रूपमाधुरी शरण ने श्रीकृष्ण के नित्य विहारी स्वरूप को मान्यता प्रदान की है । चरणदास का सखी भेष में श्रीकृष्ण द्वारा आलिंगन भी कराया है । इनके युगल सरकार दिव्य है । उनकी सखियां भी दिव्य हैं । नित्य विहार का विशद वर्णन किया ।

फुटकर कवियों के कृष्ण

श्री रूपमाधुरी शरण द्वारा संग्रहीत “श्री चरनावत वैष्णव वर्षोत्सव” नामक पुस्तक में इस सम्प्रदाय के अनेक कवियों की वाणी संग्रहीत है और विभिन्न उत्सवों पर गाये जाने वाले पद दिये गये हैं । इन पदों में विभिन्न रसों के माध्यम से श्री कृष्णोपासना का विवरण है ।

श्री जन गोविन्द के विनय के पदों में आत्म निवेदन और दास्य भाव के उदाहरण प्राप्त होते हैं :-

अब मोहे कव अपनाई हो श्याम...
कोटि कोटि तुम पतित उधारे पहुँचाये निज धाम ।
रहयो जात है सब के पीछे जन गोविन्द गुलाम ।

64. उपदेश चिन्तामणि, पृष्ठ १३९ - १४०.

65. „ „ „ १४०.

66. „ „ „ १४४.

अब तो नाथ निवाहे बनेगी ।
 जन गोविन्द की चूक अधमता अधम उधारन हाथ छनेगी ।
 एक अधम रावरे द्वार पुकारे
 जन गोविन्द आरत यही मांगे महरानी न विसरे ।⁶⁷

माधुर्य रस के पदों का बाहुल्य है :-

सखी लख बैठे प्रीतम प्यारी
 फूल सिंहामन मोहन श्यामा दोऊ गलवैया डारी ।⁶⁸

— फूल वंगला पद.

आज सखी बनी है अनोखी जौरी
 कालिन्दी के फूल मनोहर विहरत निज रुचि सौरी ।
 फूलन के शृंगार धार तन बैठे श्री दम्पति सिरताजे ।
 सरस माधुरी सन्मुख सखियां नाचत गावत करत समाजे ।⁶⁹

श्री राधिकाजी श्रीकृष्णजी का शृंगार कर रही हैं :-

श्री राधिका श्याम शृंगार फूलन करे
 फूल की मुरलि का लाल अधरन धरी प्रिया क्रीड़ा कमल
 वाम कर में धरे ।⁷⁰

श्री राधाकृष्ण के जल विहार की एक झलक जल उत्सवों के पदों में परलक्षित होती है —

दम्पति जल विहार सुख परसत
 मन मोहन “विवदास” दोउन दिशि प्रेम निरन्तर दरसत ।⁷¹
 जल जन्त्रन की वार हजारन दम्पति तन मन भीजै
 “सरस माधुरी” अंग जुगल की देख देख छवि जीजै ।⁷²

67. श्री चरनावत वैष्णव वर्षोत्सव, पृ. १०७-१०९ पद १४३ से १४५, प्रथम संस्करण १९९५.

68. ” ” ” ” १९.

69. ” ” ” ” २०.

70. ” ” ” ” २१.

71. ” ” ” ” २२.

72. ” ” ” ” २३.

युगल सरकार कभी रथ पर चढ़कर और कभी पालकी में बैठकर वन विहार करते हैं।⁷³और कभी दोनों झूला झूलते हैं।⁷⁴

वधाई और पालना के पदों में हमें भगवान के वात्सल्य स्वरूप का दर्शन होता है। यशोदा जी कभी कृष्ण को गोद में ले लेती हैं और कभी पालने में पुनः झुलाने लगती हैं। ...बहुत सावधानी से झुलाती हैं और इस सुख के लिये शिव, विरंच भी ललचाते हैं।⁷⁵

अष्टयाम सेवा के पदों में युगलकिशोर की दिन चर्या का वर्णन मिलता है। उसमें मंगल भोग के पद, मंगल आरती, शृंगार आरती के पद, शृंगार भोग के पद, शृंगार आरती, राजभोग और राज आरती के पद, उत्थापन भोग और शयन आरती के पद प्राप्य हैं।

73. बैठे आज जुगल रथ मांही करन लिये हैं वागे।

निरणत फिरत विपिन की शोभा, अति नीकी लागे। ..

“राम सखी चिर जीवो जोरी बार बार ये ही भांगे।...

देखत फिरत जुल वन शोभा चढ़ी पालकी मांह - रथ उत्सव का पद,

— श्री चरनावत वैष्णव वर्षोत्सव, पृष्ठ २३.

74. झूलत श्यामा श्याम झुलावत सब सखी हिय हुलसावनी।

मनमोहन “विवदास” जातिवल फूली अंगन सुहावनी।

— श्री चरनावत वैष्णव वर्षोत्सव, पृष्ठ २८, पद १५.

कुंजकी कुटीर दोऊ आली री उमंग भरे गावत रंग भरे धीरे धीरे झूलें।

— श्री चरनावत वैष्णव वर्षोत्सव, पृष्ठ २८, पद १६.

आज दोऊ झूलत कुंज कुटीर।

— श्री चरनावत वैष्णव वर्षोत्सव, पृष्ठ २९, पद १७.

झूलत हैं दोऊ रंग हिंडोरे गावत राग मल्हार

ओढे सुरंग चूनरी प्यारी भीजत बूंद फुहार

...फूल्यों मेरे हिय में नित राम सखी बलिहार।

— श्री चरनावत वैष्णव वर्षोत्सव, पृष्ठ ३०, पद १९.

75. कंभू कनियां ले गोद मोद खों फलना झुमक झुलावें।

कवहुँ खिलावत खयाल खिलौना लख लालन किलकावें।

“सरस माधुरी” शिव विरंच सुर या सुख को ललचावे।

— श्री चरनावत, पृष्ठ ३३-३४.

मात यशोदा प्यार प्रीति कर झोटा देत संभाल।

सरस माधुरी सन्मुख ढाड़ी निरस फंसी छवि जाल।

— श्री चरनावत वैष्णव वर्षोत्सव, पृष्ठ ३८, पद ३१.

सांझी, राम, वसन्त और होली के पदों में श्री राधाकृष्ण की युगल विहार का विशद वर्णन प्राप्य है।

लालजी ने राधाजी को ही अपना इष्ट बताया है और राधाजी को प्रधानता दी है :—

हूँ तो चेरी राधे को नाम रटूँ, राधे को सुमिरन नित राधे को
 राधेहूँ को ध्यान जू।
 भजन करूँ राधे को, इष्ट रखूँ राधे को, उपास मेरे राधे को, मन
 राधिका ही प्राण जू।
 तन मन कर आठो जाभ दास राधे को मोको आसरो इक
 राधे को और न पहचानजू।
 कल्याण की करता और हरता है चिन्ता की “लालदास”
 वारी तापे निश्चय येही जानजू।⁷⁶

साम्प्रदायिक सिद्धान्तानुसार भगवत् प्राप्ति के लिये धन, विद्या की आवश्यकता नहीं है, केवल भक्ति की आवश्यकता है।⁷⁷ उस भक्ति के आधार पर ही “राधा प्यारी” की उपासना करके मानव सन्त बन जाता है।

बैठ रहे न इकन्त मोहन मन, सन्त भयों तो सुमर पिय प्यारी।

— श्री चरणावत वैष्णव वर्षोत्सव, पृष्ठ ११४, पद १५२.

फुटकर कवियों ने दास्य भाव, वात्सल्य भाव एवं माधुर्य भाव आदि अनेक भावों से उपासना की है, किन्तु माधुर्य भाव की प्रचुरता है।

उपर्युक्त अध्ययन सामग्री से हम इस निष्कर्ष पर पहुँचते हैं कि इस सम्प्रदाय में दास्य, सख्य, वात्सल्य आदि भावों की भी उपासना होती है, किन्तु माधुर्य भाव की प्रधानता है। रासलीला में श्रीकृष्ण जी चरणदासी सखी को दाहिनी

76. श्री चरणावत वैष्णव वर्षोत्सव, पृष्ठ ५३, पद ५५.

77. श्री कृष्ण को भक्ति प्यारी है।

धन आधार रूप विद्या सौरीक्षे नहीं सुरारी है।...

प्रेम प्रीति के बस हैं हरिजी कहेँ चरणदास निचारी हैं।

“रामरूप” गुरु भक्ता हो के भक्ति हिय में धारी है।

ओर और प्रियाजी को वाई ओर स्थान देकर चरणदासी सखी का महत्व प्रतिपादित करते हैं ।

श्रीमद्भागवत एवं शुक सम्प्रदाय के कृष्ण

१. चतुर्सम्प्रदायों के पृथक् यह एक स्वतन्त्र सम्प्रदाय है, जिसके प्रथम आचार्य श्रीमद्भागवत के वक्ता श्री शुकदेव जी माने गये हैं । अतः भागवत की कृष्ण भावना से इस सम्प्रदाय की भावना पूर्ण रूपेण सम्बन्धित है ।
२. श्रीमद्भागवत में जिस तत्व को कृष्ण कहकर ब्रह्मप्रतिपादित किया, उस कृष्ण को पूर्ण कला से अवतरित ब्रह्म का अवतार माना गया है । गोपाल-कृष्ण चरणदास के इष्टदेव हैं । कृष्ण पूर्ण पुरुष, अनादि ईश, तीन लोक के स्वामी, घटघट व्यापक, अन्तर्यामी माने गये हैं ।
३. श्रीमद्भागवत में राधा का उल्लेख नहीं है, किन्तु इस सम्प्रदाय में चरणदास ने युगल उपासना को मान्यता प्रदान की है और अपने को चरणदासी सखी माना है ।
४. श्रीमद्भागवत से इस सम्प्रदाय के कृष्ण का मेल खाता है, क्योंकि इस सम्प्रदाय के कृष्ण अन्य वृन्दावनस्थ सम्प्रदायों से भावना में श्रीमद्भागवत के अधिक निकट है ।
५. श्रीमद्भागवत में वर्णित लोक रक्षक वीर स्वरूप की तरह ही इस सम्प्रदाय में पूतना वध एवं श्रीधर ब्राह्मण आदि की लीलायें प्राप्त होती हैं । इस सम्प्रदाय में श्रीकृष्ण की चौर हरण लीला, दान लीला, माखन लीला, काली नाथन लीला और कुरुक्षेत्र लीला आदि लीलायें प्राप्त हैं ।
६. श्रीमद्भागवत के प्रतिपाद्य परब्रह्म कृष्ण शुक सम्प्रदाय के इष्टदेव कृष्ण से बहुत साम्य रखते हैं ।
७. शुक सम्प्रदाय श्रीमद्भागवत को पूर्ण रूपेण मान्यता प्रदान करता है और उसका नाम करण ही श्रीमद्भागवत के वक्ता श्री शुकदेव जी के नाम पर हुआ है ।

स्पष्टतः शुक सम्प्रदाय कृष्ण को उसी भाव से मान्यता प्रदान करता है जिस भाव से भागवत ने श्रीकृष्ण को मान्यता प्रदान की है ।

हम इस निष्कर्ष पर पहुँचते हैं कि भागवत के कृष्ण से इस सम्प्रदाय का पूर्ण साम्य है । चरणदास ने अपने को चरणदासी मानकर युगल सरकार की उपासना की है, वह भी सम्भवतः भागवत के गोपीभाव का ही अनुसरण करती है, कान्ता भाव का नहीं । ऐसा प्रतीत होता है कि एक ओर यह सम्प्रदाय भागवत प्रतिपादित सर्वतोमुखी विकसित कृष्ण को मान्यता प्रदान करता है और दूसरी ओर वह वृन्दावन के माधुर्योपासक सम्प्रदायों के कृष्ण की युगल उपासना की मान्यता प्रदान करता है । वस्तुतः इस सम्प्रदाय के कृष्ण, भागवत के कृष्ण और वृन्दावनस्थ माधुर्योपासक सम्प्रदायों के कृष्ण का समन्वयात्मक रूप है ।

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

1. *Prof. T. Kodandaramaiah* ... Professor of Telugu,
Madurai University,
MADURAI-2.
2. *Sri D. Satyanarayana* ... Librarian,
Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha,
TIRUPATI.
3. *Dr. R. S. Betai* ... Reader in Sanskrit,
Gujarat Vidyapith,
AHMEDABAD-14.
4. *Arati Mitra* ... Lecturer in Sanskrit,
Krishnagar Women's College,
143, Raja Rajendralalmitra Road,
CALCUTTA-10.
5. *Dr. Bani Chakravorty* ... Lecturer in Sanskrit,
11, Kalikumar Lane,
CALCUTTA-2.
6. *Dr. P. Sriramamurti* ... Reader in Sanskrit,
Andhra University,
WALTAIR.
7. *Dr. N. Subbu Reddiar* ... Head of the Department of Tamil,
S.V. University,
TIRUPATI.
8. *Sri K. N. Srinivasan* ... Advocate,
"Manipaduka",
Seshadripuram,
TIRUCHIRAPALLI-6.
9. *Dr. Umakant Thakur* ... St. Joseph's College,
DARJEELING (W.B.).
10. *Sri Mithilesh Chaturvedi* ... 5/13, Roop Nagar,
DELHI-7.
11. *Prof. V. Perumal* ... Director - Research Project,
K. G. F. First Grade College,
OORGAUM, Kolar Gold Field,
Karnataka State.

12. *Dr. S. G. Moghe* ... Lecturer in Sanskrit,
Elphinstone College,
BOMBAY-32.
13. *Sri H. V. Ramagopal* ... Senior Instructor in Painting,
Govt. School of Arts & Crafts,
KUMBAKONAM,
Tanjore District.
14. *Sri B. V. Srinivasa Rao* ... Head of the Dept. of History,
First Grade College,
OORGAUM,
K.G.F. (Karnataka).
15. *Dr. Biswanath Bhattacharya* ... Adhyapaka in Sanskrit,
Vidyabhavana,
Visvabharati University,
Santiniketan, West Bengal.
16. *Dr. V. Krishnaswamy Iyengar* ... Reader,
Central Hindi Institute,
AGRA-5.
17. *Dr. (Miss) Sushama Kulshreshtha*... Senior Lecturer in Sanskrit,
Daulat Ram College,
University of Delhi,
DELHI.
18. *Sri K. J. Krishna Moorthy* ... Lecturer in Telugu,
S. V. U. O. R. Institute,
TIRUPATI.
19. *Dr. Chandraprakash Agarwal* ... Ex-Magistrate,
Kedarnath Street,
FARRUKHABAD (U.P.).

**PUBLICATIONS OF
S.V. UNIVERSITY ORIENTAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE
TIRUPATI**

The following is the list of publications available for sale at prices mentioned against them. S.V. University Oriental Journal is the only multi-lingual publication. It contains articles in English, Sanskrit and Telugu. In some of the numbers articles in Tamil or Hindi also are published.

S.No.	Particulars of Work	Price
		Rs. Ps.
1.	S.V. University Oriental Journal Vol. I Parts 1 & 2 (1958)	10-00
2.	-do- Vol. VIII Parts 1 & 2 (1965)	10-00
3.	-do- Vol. IX Parts 1 & 2 (1966)	10-00
4.	-do- Vol. X Parts 1 & 2 (1967)	10-00
5.	-do- Vol. XI Parts 1 & 2 (1968)	10-00
6.	-do- Vol. XII Parts 1 & 2 (1969)	10-00
7.	-do- Vol. XIII Parts 1 & 2 (1970)	10-00
8.	-do- Vol. XIV Parts 1 & 2 (1971)	15-00
9.	-do- Vol. XV Parts 1 & 2 (1972)	15-00
*10.	-do- Vol. XVI Parts 1 & 2 (1973)	15-00
11.	Gajagrahaṇaprakāra of Nārāyaṇa Dīkṣita Edited with Introduction by Prof. E.R. Sreekrishna Sarma, M.A., Ph.D.	1968 2-50
12.	Apāṇinīyaprāmāṇyasādhanaṁ of Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭapāda Edited with Introduction, English Translation and Notes by Prof. E.R. Sreekrishna Sarma, M.A., Ph.D.	1968 0-75
13.	Kāvyaṁptam of Śivatsaṁhāna Edited with Introduction by Dr. K.S. Ramamurti, M.A., Ph.D.	1971 3-25
14.	Kamalāvilāsabhāṣa of Nārāyaṇakavi Edited with Introduction by Dr. K.S. Ramamurti, M.A., Ph.D.	1971 0-50

* Proceedings of the Seminar on 'Andhrās' Contribution to Indian Culture'.

15. Vijayavikramavyāyoga of Āryasūrya
Edited with Introduction by
Dr. K.S. Ramamurti, M.A., Ph.D. 1972 1-00
16. Vedāntasārācintāmaṇi of Sītārāmasāstri
Edited with Introduction by
Dr. M.S. Narayanamurti, M.A., Ph.D. 1973 2-00
17. Pādukāpaṭṭābhīṣekam of Nārāyaṇakavi
Edited with Introduction by
Dr. K.S. Ramamurti, M.A., Ph.D. 1974 2-50
18. Pradyumnacaritramu (Telugu) of Muppirāla
Subbarāyakavi
Edited with Introduction and Notes by
Prof. J. Chenna Reddy, M.A., Ph.D. 1975 6-25
19. An Alphabetical Index of Sanskrit, Telugu
and Tamil Manuscripts (Palm-leaf and Paper)
in the Sri Venkateswara University Oriental
Research Institute Library, Tirupati. 1956 10-00

FORTHCOMING PUBLICATIONS

20. Kṛṣṇavilāsa (a Kāvya in 11 cantos) of Puṇyakōṭi
with Vyākhyāna
Edited with Introduction by
Dr. K.S. Ramamurti, M.A., Ph.D.
21. Śṛtirañjanī – A Commentary on the Gītagovinda
of Jayadeva
Edited with Introduction by
Dr. K.S. Ramamurti, M.A., Ph.D.

-
1. All the above Publications are now supplied only on pre-payment of cost and postage either by money-order or demand draft, payable to the Registrar of this University.
 2. A Trade discount of 25% is allowed to all the Registered Book-sellers only.
 3. The annual subscription rates of the S.V. University Oriental Journal are as follows :

1. Inland	...	Rs. 15/- (Post free)
2. Foreign*	...	£ 1 and 15 shillings or 4 Dollars.

* The Journal is sent post free by surface mail, but if the party requires it to be despatched by air-mail, the air-mail charges have to be borne by the party.

N.B. : The foreign rates of volumes I to XIII are 20 Shillings or 2 Dollars and 50 cents.

**Statement of ownership and other particulars about
Sri Venkateswara University Oriental Journal**

**FORM IV
(See Rule No. 8)**

- | | | |
|--|-----|--|
| 1. Place of publication | ... | Sri Venkateswara University Oriental
Research Institute, Tirupati,
Andhra Pradesh. |
| 2. Periodicity of its publication | ... | Half Yearly. |
| 3. Printer's name | ... | Dr. M.J. Kesava Murthy, M.Sc., Ph.D.
Registrar-in-charge,
S. V. University. |
| Nationality | ... | Indian. |
| Address | ... | S. V. University Press,
Tirupati. |
| 4. Publisher's name | ... | Prof. J. Chenna Reddy, M.A., Ph.D. |
| Nationality | ... | Indian. |
| Address | ... | Director,
S. V. U. O. R. Institute,
Tirupati. |
| 5. Editor's name | ... | Prof. J. Chenna Reddy, M.A., Ph.D. |
| Nationality | ... | Indian. |
| Address | ... | Director,
S. V. U. O. R. Institute,
Tirupati. |
| 6. Name and address of individuals who own the periodical. | ... | Sri Venkateswara University,
Tirupati. |

I, Prof. J. Chenna Reddy, hereby declare that the particulars given above are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

J. CHENNA REDDY,
Publisher.

SRI VENKATESWARA UNIVERSITY
ORIENTAL JOURNAL
TIRUPATI

1. The Journal is the official organ of the Sri Venkateswara University.
2. Each volume of the Journal appears in 2 Parts — Part 1 in June and Part 2 in December.
3. Contributions on indological subjects and oriental culture are accepted from the reputed scholars mainly in three languages — English, Sanskrit and Telugu.
4. Each contribution must be legibly and clearly written or typewritten on only one side of the paper and sent made completely press ready.
5. The Editor reserves to himself the right of accepting, rejecting or modifying any contribution received for publication. Contributors are advised to keep copies of their articles as the editor does not undertake the responsibility to return the rejected articles
6. Every author will receive 25 off-prints of his or her article free of charge besides a copy of the issue of the Journal containing that particular article.
7. Books on Indology in English, Sanskrit, Dravidian languages and Hindi are reviewed in the Journal. Two copies of the books intended for review are to be sent to the Editor.
8. All enquiries and communications regarding the editing and publishing of the Journal should be addressed to

The Editor,

S. V. UNIVERSITY ORIENTAL JOURNAL
TIRUPATI – 517502
(Andhra Pradesh), South India.

Printed by : The Registrar-in-charge, S.V. University at the S.V. University Press,
Tirupati, 30-10-1975, 300 copies.

Published by : Prof. J. CHENNA REDDY, M.A., Ph.D., Director, S.V. University
Oriental Research Institute. Tirupati.

